

Waterhouse

#W

THE NEGATIVE ON THAT QUESTION:
Whether is The Archangel *Michael*, OUR
SAVIOUR? examined and defended.

A N

Gal 11 M. C.

ARGUMENT

Designed to prove

The Real Humanity of CHRIST.

To which are annex'd

Observations for illustrating the Doctrine of
Those Appearances under The Old Testament,
which are generally term'd ANGELICAL: .

TOGETHER WITH

A full Interpretation of such of those Narratives, as
are particularly refer'd to by THE AUTHOR of

THE ESSAY on *SPIRIT*.

IN A

LETTER

To the Right Reverend

The Lord Bishop of *CHLOGER*.

By *SAYER RUDD*, M. D.

Minister of *Walmer* in *KENT*.

BEWARE *least any Man spoil you through Philosophy and vain
Deceit, after the Tradition of Men, after the Rudiments of
the World, and not after CHRIST: For in HIM dwelleth the
Fulness of THE GODHEAD bodily.* Col. II. 8, 9.

L O N D O N:

Printed for THE AUTHOR; and sold by S. BIRT,
at the Bible and Ball in *Ave-Mary-Lane*; and
T. SMITH, in *Canterbury*. 1753.

8

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE AUTHOR writes in NO profess'd SCHEME. The sole object of his inquiry is DIVINE TRUTH. In this pursuit his attempts are intirely confin'd to a plain, consistent interpretation of HOLY SCRIPTURE. Where he may have fail'd in the execution, the one favour, that he has to beg of the judicious reader, as an acquisition, preferable, in his esteem, to every temporal emolument, is: That he would have goodness and condescension enough to point-out his mistakes; promising, on conviction, to retract such mistakes, both immediately and publicly. Having, likewise, this farther declaration to make: That, where he may, in any case, have taken the liberty to depart from POPULAR EXPLICATIONS; it is done with the highest reluctance on his own part, and with the most perfect deference to the judgment of HIS SUPERIORS: Who are therefore humbly intreated, to consider every peculiarity of sentiment (waving, at the same time, the form of expression) as a matter of HYPOTHESIS only.

THE

ADVERTISSEMENT.

THE Author avows in no concealed manner, the sole object of his intention, to give TRUTH, in this plain, but his arguments are entirely confined to a plain, consistent interpretation of HOLY SCRIPTURE. While he may have failed in the execution, the one thing, that he has to beg of the judicious reader, as an acquittal, practicable, in this respect, to every temporal government, is: That he would have goodness and candour enough to point out his mistakes; pointing, on conviction, to rectify such mistakes, both immediately and publicly. Having, likewise, this further declaration to make: That, where he errs, in any case, have taken the liberty to depart from former expressions; it is done with the highest reluctance on his own part, and with the most perfect deference to the judgment of his superiors: Who are therefore humbly entreated, to consider every peculiarity of sentiment (waving at the same time the form of expression) as a matter of hypothesis only.



T H E
N E G A T I V E, &c.

May it please your Lordship,



O pardon one, that is the lowest and meanest of those, who have the honour of being named among the clergy of the church of *England*; while he endeavours a few observations on your lordship's late treatise entitled *An Essay on SPIRIT*. He ventures to call it your's, as the public, in general, are agreed to speak of it by that name; and as your lordship, if wrongfully charged, has never, yet, disavowed the imputation.

If his motives to an attempt of this kind are inquired after, the first and most general, is, a sincere desire of investigating truth. That, if hitherto mistaken himself, he may, at last,

thoroughly correct his own errors ; and, if haply in the right, be a means of exciting others to take the same liberty with, and do the like justice by, themselves.—Not but your lordship's high station in the church, and celebrated character for refin'd learning and consummate judgement, awaken our attention, and command an accurate inspection of such pieces, as we have reason to believe the produce of your masterly pen.—But chiefly, does the honour of those great personages, the blessed JESUS, as OUR SAVIOUR ; and THE HOLY GHOST, as OUR SANCTIFIER ; call us to deliberate on the representations made by your lordship in those sublime and interesting points.—Allow the person, now addressing your lordship, the liberty of saying, that he is truly jealous for the glory of BOTH : and therefore the more, because, at present, he cannot but apprehend, that they are real sufferers by the doctrine of *The Essay*.

THESE, undoubtedly, are subjects of that prodigious importance both to the christian church, and the body of the human species, as to deserve the attention of those, who make the greatest figure amongst us for theological wisdom. But as the public has long waited in vain for something in their illustration and defence, from writers of this superior class ; it is hoped, the present attempt will incur no worse censure with the serious christian, than that of an honest and laudable ambition, to serve in a cause truly great in itself ; but, on the present occasion, too generally neglected. Since,

as

as is said above, the author has nothing more at heart, than either the honour of convincing others, or the happiness of becoming a convert himself; as truth may be found on his, or the opposite side of the question.

THIS, likewise, he dares promise, in reference to your lordship, that nothing shall divert him from comporting with that humble deference, which you have certainly a right to challenge, through the course of these remarks. Not doubting but your lordship, in return, will condescend to indulge him a proper freedom of inquiry, and openness of speech; as privileges necessary for leading us to that satisfaction, which, he is well assured, your lordship, and every sincere lover of truth, is chiefly desirous of acquiring, not only in the present, but every religious disquisition in general.

THE WHOLE of your lordship's *Essay*, if I am capable of judging aright, may be distributed under these three general heads: namely,

FIRST, What is advanced with respect to the nature of spirit in general; and therefore, more expressly of God, the one infinite, self-existent SPIRIT.

SECONDLY, What is suggested concerning the metaphysical nature or substance of CHRIST. And

THIRDLY, What is deliver'd in reference to the person generally stil'd THE HOLY GHOST,

or HOLY SPIRIT.—For, as these several heads take in the whole doctrine of the TRINITY; so, will they, of course, I presume, the intire substance of your lordship's *Essay*.

As to the first of these heads, it will no farther come under our present cognizance, than as it may be necessary to transcribe from it, or refer to it, either to inform us in your lordship's sentiments, or illustrate our own reasoning, on the other two heads.

I WOULD then beg leave to enter on that part of *The Essay*, which we have here made the second; and which, therefore, leads us to examine into the metaphysical nature of CHRIST, the mediatorial person.—And here our immediate concern will be, to acquaint ourselves perfectly with your lordship's scheme. The question, however, in your state of it appears, at first sight, so far involv'd, that we can hardly be sure, whether your lordship is of opinion, that the super-angelical SPIRIT, which you compliment OUR SAVIOUR with, was that spirit, which, on his conception and birth, wholly animated the particular system of matter, which served his as a body; or, whether, besides this super-angelical spirit, he was not likewise in possession of another spirit; one, that we call human, in order to his sharing both the constituent parts of a true and perfect man: and, consequently, whether both these intelligent spirits and the body, which he assumed, were not united in such manner, as
to

to constitute one individual person, or distinct intelligent agent. The reason of this difficulty is : that your lordship, once and again, speaks of the human nature of CHRIST¹, as a thing distinct from his super-angelical spirit ; and, on account of which [in part] your lordship acknowledges his inferiority to THE FATHER : and likewise, of the pre-existent spirit of the LOGOS, and the union of that exalted spirit with human nature ; ² as tho', by THE LOGOS itself, you intended this super-angelical existence in distinction from another spirit, belonging to him, in consequence of his standing fully possessed of the human nature.

INDEED, my lord, I cannot so far dissemble my thoughts, as not to own that, as those terms, the human nature, are generally understood to mean the conjunction of body and spirit in our own constitution ; I should be inclined to suspect, that your lordship must certainly be understood to use the words in that popular sense, were it not, that the supposition would be the greatest contradiction to those many specimens, which your lordship has given us of the deepest penetration and closest reasoning in some other parts of *The Essay*. Were it then, for this reason only (tho' we shall, probably, find it back'd by another) I could never indulge myself the least suspicion of this sort. And am, therefore, on the contrary, rather of opinion, that your lordship

¹ See Essay, § xcvi. and xcix, &c.

² Ibid. § cxi.

must have used those terms (though in a sense, undoubtedly, less common and strict) for that organical disposition of body, which OUR LORD assumed of the virgin; and by the instrumentality of which, he appeared to the natural eye, and acted in the common affairs of life, as a mere man.

By this expedient it is, that I have at last, brought the argument to a point with myself. And therefore, take it, that your lordship's hypothesis is plainly this: namely, that OUR SAVIOUR did not possess a true reasonable soul, like ours, to constitute him a real man of our precise structure; but, that the archangel *Michael*, as a superior spiritual existence, being united to that system of organized matter, which served OUR LORD in quality of a body; performed the several offices of a reasonable soul in it: and therefore, not only gave him his supreme dignity, as THE SON of GOD; but was also his chief personal qualification for the mediatorial charge.

PARDON it, my lord, to one, who truly reveres your person, if he mistake in the present representation; tho' he confesses, he sees little, or no cause, to hesitate in the point, preserving your lordship consistent with yourself. For if this be not your lordship's scheme, respecting the personal constitution of THE SON; he cannot, possibly, find out, what the objection is, that you could have to the common doctrine of hypostatical union. Because, on supposition, that a super-angelical spirit and a human

man spirit may be substantially united in such an organized body as ours, to constitute one intelligent being ; on the same principle, and with parity of reason, might your lordship also admit the substantial conjunction of the divine and human natures in the person of CHRIST. But, as you avowedly object to the other parts of the trinitarian hypothesis, I therefore take it for granted, on this farther reason, that this part likewise is equally given up.

IT is, indeed, to be observ'd that, while your lordship is thus taking leave of the whole popular scheme, you certainly do it with more honour, than any of your predecessors. For, whereas, they, as persons afraid to speak out, have always been mean enough to cover themselves under such saving expressions as these: *whatever their metaphysical nature may be, &c* ; speaking of THE SON and HOLY SPIRIT: your lordship, as having the cause at heart, and therefore acting with equal zeal and integrity, has not scrupled telling us, that the archangel *Michael* is OUR SAVIOUR, and that the angel *Gabriel* is the HOLY GHOST. Thus, in respect of the former, substituting a mere created spirit [for he is this only, be he ever so exalted] in the room of THE indwelling GODHEAD ; as the best method with your lordship, for doing honour to OUR SAVIOUR's person, and for securing the virtue of his mediatorial undertakings. And, in respect of the latter, introducing a still lower nature to perform

form such operations, as are at least equal, not to say superior, to those, which holy scripture attributes to OUR SAVIOUR himself.

It is in this light, that your lordship's hypothesis, in my humble opinion, appears to challenge the closest examination of every real christian. And, it is, indeed, in this view of it, especially, that I venture into the service myself; wishing I were master of abilities equal to the importance of the subject.

Now the grand principle, on which your lordship is pleased to build your reasonings [be your real and intire scheme what it will] is evidently this: namely, that “there seems no
“ Contradiction, in supposing that God might
“ communicate so much Power to one of his
“ own Creatures, of a more exalted Nature than
“ Man, as to enable him to create inferior Be-
“ ings, and frame a World of his own, com-
“ posed of intelligent Agents:”¹ consequently, therefore, to govern that world, and perform every thing necessary for it's service, according as it's estate might be pure or degenerate.— And again, *The Essay* supposes: that “the
“ one God may——create an infinite Series of
“ spiritual Agents, in Subordination one to a-
“ nother; some of which may, by an Autho-
“ rity communicated to them, from the su-
“ preme God, act *as gods*, with regard to
“ those inferior Beings, who are committed
“ into their Charge”.²

¹ See *Essay*, § xxx.

² *Ibid.* § cxiv.

IT is then upon this estimate of things, that your lordship is pleased to assert, concerning the person of OUR SAVIOUR and THE blessed SPIRIT, in the manner represented above: I mean, that, as to the one, he is no other than *Michael*, the archangel; and, that the other, truly, is nothing more than the angel *Gabriel*. From whence we have it in our power, to draw no other conclusions than these: namely, that, as to their natures, they are merely of the angelical kind; and that, in respect of their divinity, it terminates wholly in a delegated power. Upon both which opinions, your lordship will pardon me for putting the negative; and endeavouring to vindicate the honour of THE SON and HOLY SPIRIT from what, till I have other views, I cannot help calling a representation equally low and dishonourable.

IT is the negative then, to which I design, particularly, to confine myself on both these questions. In making which attempt, I shall think myself obliged to examine the merits of each, so far as I may be capable of it, both on the principles of natural reason and the dictates of divine revelation: which method will therefore lead me of necessity into your lordship's reasonings on the one hand, and your interpretation of scripture on the other.

NOW, notwithstanding every allowance, in what relates to the power of THE ALMIGHTY; as, that he is capable of doing every thing, which does not involve a contradiction to the
purity

purity and perfection of his nature: that he should, however, have appointed the archangel *Michael* to be OUR SAVIOUR (for it is necessary, that we begin with that branch of the subject;) is to me highly improbable for a variety of considerations, which present themselves to view from a double head of reasoning: namely, first, the private personal constitution of a MEDIATOR and SAVIOUR, in reference to ourselves, the human species. And, secondly, the various business, both as to obedience and suffering, that stands annexed to those characters; and that a person so charged, must be obliged to go through, for executing those offices with dignity to himself, and success to mankind. Wherefore,

FIRST, To enter on that sett of arguments, which arise from the former of these heads; I mean, the necessary, personal structure of THE SAVIOUR himself; always understanding that term in reference to ourselves. — Wherefore that no angelical, or super-angelical nature, can share a constitution, in his own metaphysical structure, agreeable to, or fitted for, the great business of becoming a SAVIOUR to us of the human nature; appears to me with the last evidence for several reasons, which your lordship will permit me to adduce in the following order:

I. BECAUSE Almighty God perpetually acts with the strictest consistency or propriety, and never as an arbitrary, precipitant agent. There
is

is therefore in all, that he does, a certain proportion or correspondence : an agreement between the work, that is to be done, and the means by which, he intends to effect it : consequently, therefore, in the present case, a near relation or affinity between the creatures, who are the subjects of redemption, and the person by whom he designs to redeem them. Nothing is more common in nature, as well as scripture-history than to observe, that temporal blessings and punishments are an entail on the foot of natural or civil relation. For as much then, as THE ALMIGHTY always acts with the last regard to the reason and fitness of things ; does it not seem highly necessary to suppose that, in the affair of salvation, he would, in the very first place, have respect to the particular nature, which he proposed to redeem ? And therefore that, as this nature precisely terminated in the human, reasonable species ; so, that he would choose ONE from among themselves, as a person, the best qualified by his very nature, with whom he might intrust so important a charge ?

THE MEDIATORIAL work lay directly between GOD and man. Who, therefore, so proper to treat with THE ALMIGHTY for man, as one, who should himself sustain that nature, under the necessary qualifications ? Not a mere man, or a simple human spirit ; but one of that species so circumstanced, as to give him nearness of access to, and proper interest with, the majesty of heaven : and yet one who, in his

his most distant remove from DIVINITY, might share such a situation, as should render him capable of doing and suffering those things, which the condition of the nature for whom he undertook, should make necessary.

AND is not this, the precise view of things into which that portion of scripture directs us, where it is said: *he layeth not hold of [fallen] angels, but of the seed of Abraham he layeth hold* *. And wherefore did he pass by, or why did he not help, the angelical species? but because he was not of their nature: it being here supposed necessary, that he should partake of that nature himself (which can never consist in his wearing the inferior part only, the shell, of the man; that he should himself partake of that nature) which he was to save or redeem. And therefore, on the contrary, *he laid hold of the seed of Abraham*, because he himself was truly of their nature, a perfect man, possessing an human body and a reasonable soul, as did they, the other branches of that nature. Agreeable to this we shall find, as

II. A SECOND argument in our favour, that the human nature [which, I am humbly of opinion, cannot subsist without the presence of the human, rational spirit; the human nature] is actually made the substratum or basis of the mediatorial person in holy scripture;

* Heb. ii. 16. *Ἐπιλαμβάνεται*, manum injicit.

considering that person, as before observed, in an absolute remove from all communion with DEITY, or admitting no relation or union between THE DIVINE and MEDIATORIAL BEINGS. Now, this supposition being made, what the apostle asserts is: that the supreme being is GOD, that is, pure, absolute spirit; and that THE MEDIATOR is an human intelligence. His words are these: *There is ONE GOD and ONE MEDIATOR between GOD and men, the man CHRIST JESUS*¹.—These last words, indeed, CHRIST JESUS, doubtless include his person, as man, under certain qualifications: namely, his unction and THE indwelling GODHEAD. But, as we said above, every idea of that kind being wholly abstracted, and THE MEDIATOR consider'd in absolute distinction from DEITY; it is plain that, in this light, he is to be regarded as man, and as such only; and therefore as possessing the same common nature with men; founded, especially, in his being animated with a reasonable soul of the same kind with theirs. This appears, I imagine, a *sine qua non*, an indispensable ingredient, in the constitution of his person, as MEDIATOR. Because (agreeable to the preceding observation) the whole of his business, in this quality, lies between DEITY on the one part, as the majesty offended; and humanity, on the other part, as the nature offending. If this be not a true state of the case, where is the distinction of

¹ 1 Tim. ii. 5.

persons in the apostle's account, between THE ONE GOD and THE ONE MEDIATOR ? Or where is there any congruity or proportion between the different parties at variance, I mean, GOD and men ; and the man CHRIST JESUS, here said to sustain the character of an umpire, or middle person, between them ? Hence, again, we see farther into another representation of the same apostle respecting OUR SAVIOUR, which may constitute

III. A THIRD argument in proof of his being a perfect man, or of his having united in his person an human body and a reasonable soul : namely, where he speaks of him under the character of *the second man*. We meet with the account I Cor. xv. 47, *The first man is of the earth, earthy ; the second man is THE LORD from heaven*. I presume, my lord, it will be immediately seen, on the very reading these words, that the first man and the second man are here opposed : that the first *Adam* and the second *Adam* stand, as it were, in contrast, or answer each other as type and anti-type. And again : that St. Paul here speaks of them, as if there were only these two men in the world ; and therefore considers them in their public capacity, as the two great representatives of the human nature ; as the whole of it falls under that general division, by which all men are either good or bad, righteous or wicked. If then they stand here, as they evidently do, for the whole body of the human species ;
and

and the former be absolutely a man, as representing his natural descendants; the latter, surely, on the same principle, must likewise be a man; as representing also a particular division of the same species. If they are upon a par with regard to office, there seems to be equal reason for concluding, that they are likewise on a par with regard to nature: since the latter seems to lay the best ground for the former, among creatures of the same common essence, as the good and bad are.

NOR is this all: for as it is past doubt with me, that there is sufficient evidence to conclude, that the second *Adam* is as much an human intelligence as the first *Adam*, from the characters they respectively bear, or the general relation, which they stand in to mankind, under the distribution above: so shall we likewise have it in our power to supply ourselves with additional proof on this article, when we have taken a view of their respective deportment under those characters, or the different parts, which they act in relation to the nature they represent, consider'd in it's fall on the one part, and it's recovery on the other. To illustrate this by particular examples, let the following inquiries be made: Who was it, that was foil'd by satan's temptations? A man. Again, on the contrary, who was the person, that vanquish'd the tempter himself? A man. Who was it, that transgress'd the law of his creation, and by that means laid himself open to deserv'd punishment? A man. Again: who was

B

the

the person, that fulfill'd all righteousness, and, by submitting to the sentence denounc'd, averted the curse? A man. Once more: who was it, that brought death upon himself and his posterity by his disobedience? A man. On the contrary: who was it brought life and immortality to light by his doctrine and resurrection? A man. For thus the apostle speaks in the context, saying: *Since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead*, ver. 21. — Now the reason on which the above questions, with others of like import, may be put, I take to be this: that it seems quite necessary on the foot of analogy, or what is term'd the fitness of things, that in the same nature, in which the majesty of heaven had been injur'd, in that same nature satisfaction reciprocally ought to be made: divine justice, as it were, by this means, turning satan's own weapons directly against himself. Which means that, as he had from malice, and through subtilty, seduced the human nature in *Adam*, the first man, to rebel against heaven: so that now, in return, it should be ordered in such sort, that his works should be destroyed, and his kingdom overthrown, in the same nature, by *CHRIST*, the second *Adam*.

NOT, indeed, but it is here likewise to be observ'd, as necessary to do justice to OUR SAVIOUR in the present particular, that the above distribution of mankind under their respective public heads, *Adam*, for the natural seed, and *CHRIST*, for the spiritual; is to be understood,

as taking place only with respect to their moral circumstances; I mean, as they fall under the distinction of good and bad, righteous and wicked. For the truth (taking mankind at large, or in their common natural capacity) undoubtedly is: that THE LORD *from heaven* [pre-existing in his human spirit, as *the beginning of the creation of GOD*¹;] is, in fact, the absolute head of the whole nature; that so, *he might in all things have the pre-eminence*². CHRIST is truly the root and exemplar of the intire human species. And he must certainly make a strange figure in this relation, who bears no other resemblance to the bulk of mankind, than what results from so inferior a part of the man, as the body only. Surely, due reflection allowed, it can never be supposed, that so distant an interest as this, can give any one just claim to stand at the head of the human nature; when, as has been often observ'd, the reasonable soul, as the alone distinguishing criterion of that nature, is intirely wanting. But to proceed:

IV. I THINK, it is agreed on all hands that, among the various orders in the scale of being, the human is absolutely *the middle nature*. But that allowed, it must then also, of consequence, be the proper point of union to all creatures, as well superior as inferior. If the human be *the middle nature* in the chain of

¹ Rev. iii. 14. Col. i. 15 and 18.

² Ibid.

created beings, then all the several links in that chain of existence (let the gradations on each side be ever so numerous, the several links) must of necessity unite in that one, common point. And this exactly corresponds with the place, which St. Paul tells us, THE ALMIGHTY has assign'd the mediatorial person : or, in other words, comes up to the precise use which THE DIVINE BEING proposed to himself, by setting up this particular constitution : namely, that he might make him the centre of union to his several other creatures, be they of what nature or dignity they will. The passage, which I refer to is this : *that in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he [GOD THE FATHER] might gather together in one all things in CHRIST, both which are in the heavens¹, and which are in earth, even IN HIM².*

Now from this disposition of things it will appear, that the angelical, and so the several created beings of an higher order, are for ever excluded the mediatorial office, and by consequence, all the great concerns of redemption ; being plainly incapacitated for these transactions by the peculiar metaphysical structure of their respective natures. And that being thus remov'd, by several gradations, above that middle nature, which is alone proper to these services, they actually come in as so many appendages, or different lines, connected with, and uniting in this central point. On the contrary, this again, is the evident reason, why

¹ Ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

² Eph. i. 10.

all created beings, of a nature inferior to ours, are, and cannot, likewise, but be, excluded, as above. Because these also, as so many links in the lower extreme of existence, are found to meet equally in the same centre of union.

WHEREFORE, this being a just state of the case, as CHRIST is expressly declared to be THE one and only MEDIATOR between GOD and men; and it appears, that no nature, either of a superior or inferior quality to that of our own, is, in it's essential construction, a proper medium in the scale of being; it follows, I imagine, as a necessary conclusion, either that CHRIST is not THE MEDIATOR (which would be to contradict scripture) or that he is a true and perfect man, as the nature and necessity of the thing plainly require. Add to this

V. THOSE accounts, which tell us, in one place, that THE MEDIATOR was to be raised up from among *his brethren*¹; and, in another place, that he was to be chosen from among *the people*². [For tho', as to it's literal import, *David*, the victorious king of *Israel*, be undoubtedly intended in the latter of these texts; yet expositors, in general, are agreed, that it's spiritual reference terminates on CHRIST, as *David's* antitype.] Now tho' we should explain *his brethren*, in the former place, in a more restrain'd sense, to intimate that CHRIST, according to the flesh, was to descend from the stock of *Abraham*, and so arise from

¹ Deut. xviii. 18.

² Ps. lxxxix. 19.

among his brethren *the Jews*, literally so call'd; and should understand the word *people*, in the latter place, as applicable to the body of mankind in general; both accounts, however, would, at last, meet in this one point: that THE MESSIAH was actually rais'd up, and chosen from among the human nature, and not the angelical species¹.

AND, as to *brethren* in particular, we all know in what sense, and to what kind of persons, OUR LORD himself applies the term, when he says by *David*, his type: *I will declare thy name unto my brethren: in the midst of the congregation will I praise thee*². Words, which the apostle expressly brings down to CHRIST; and from whence he takes occasion to observe, in regard to all true christians, that OUR LORD *is not ashamed to call them brethren*³. And, I humbly presume, the idea inseparable from this relative character, in the common usage of the word among ourselves, informs us, that creatures of the same intelligent nature are always intended, wherever it occurs.—If then the term *brethren*, always signifies persons of the same common nature, and CHRIST be actually rais'd up from among *his brethren*; is not this sufficient to assure us, that he is an

¹ CHRISTUS, ad quem dixi hoc oraculum esse referendum, eligitur non ex angelis aut cœlestibus principatibus, sed ex genere humano, de populo Judaico, caro ex carne ejus, os ex ossibus ejus, ut frater inter fratres imperium obtineret. Mollæus in Ps. lxxxix. 19.

² Ps. xxii. 22.

³ Heb. ii. 11, 12.

human, reasonable existence? Unless this be allowed, there appears to me no proper foundation for the present description. For if THE MESSIAH do not really possess that, which constitutes the peculiar essence of a man (which by no means settles in the body, or case;) with what truth or propriety can it be asserted, that he is either chosen from among *the people*, or rais'd up from among *his brethren*? When it is certain, that it is the human intelligence or spirit, which gives them their distinguishing character in the scale of created beings. Tho' it is possible, this fact may yet appear with stronger evidence, if we take along with us those other words in the text; for *Moses* adds: *A prophet like unto me*. Which, it is reasonable enough to suppose, may be design'd to express a similitude of nature, as well as of character; or, in other words, that CHRIST, this future prophet, was to be a man, like *Moses*; as well as a saviour, a law-giver, and the rest. Because, I take it for granted that, there can be little ground for a comparison of this sort, if THE MESSIAH was to be like *Moses* merely in the external shape, or bodily organs of a man; and the resemblance did not, at the same time, extend to that part of the human nature, which is internal and principal; meaning, a soul of the same rank and structure with our own. But of this again, in another place. Wherefore to subjoin what is yet more express:

VI. It is observable, in the next place, that holy scripture frequently speaks of *his soul* or *spirit*; particularly where St. *Matthew* gives us an account of OUR LORD's agony in the garden, and of his saying upon that occasion: *My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death*¹. With which St. *Mark*'s relation likewise agrees, ch. xiv. 34.——So again, his expiring on the cross is described by his *yielding up the ghost*, in St. *Matthew*'s gospel²: which is also St. *Luke*'s account of his death, with this additional circumstance (highly deserving our notice in the present case;) that it was preceded by OUR LORD's charging HIS FATHER, in a very particular manner, with his unbodied spirit. For the text at length reads thus: *And when JESUS had cried with a loud voice, he said: FATHER, into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said thus, he gave up the ghost*³. So *David*, having, under a prophetic impulse, a view of the change, which OUR LORD was to suffer on his crucifixion, by the dissolution of his human frame, as a real man; speaks concerning him in these words, personating, as we may suppose, THE MESSIAH himself: *Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption*⁴. Here then we may observe, are the two things we want; the two constituents of the real man, *body* and *soul*: with respect to the former of which it is said, that THE ALMIGHTY would not suf-

¹ Ch. xxvi. 38.² Ch. xxvii. 50.³ Ch. xxiii.

46.

⁴ Acts, ii. 27.

fer it to rot or putrify in the grave. — And with respect to the latter, that he would not leave it in a separate state of existence; as is the case with other departed spirits in common. —

Not, perhaps, but we may likewise, *en passant*, be allowed to observe from hence, that as this *edns* intends the separate state peculiar to departed spirits, and is what OUR SAVIOUR calls *paradise*, with respect to the just ' [which proves it to be appropriate to spirits of our own species:] so that it having been the place of residence to CHRIST'S soul, during it's separation from the body; it affords us no slender reason for concluding, that *his spirit* must have been of the same precise structure with theirs, whose common receptacle it was. Were it not so (pardon the freedom of expression) one might justly ask: what business had it there? But to pass this, and attend the argument, as it rises from the premises in general.

IF there be then any propriety in language; any fix'd ideas to terms, even those too, the most plain and simple, what are we to conclude? But that OUR SAVIOUR made use of these words in the same common-determinate sense, in which we use them every day among ourselves. And, consequently, that by *spirit* and *soul*, in these places, he absolutely intends the like rational principle with that, which animates our own bodies; and, by no means, an intelligence of a different, or superior con-

struction. Luke xxiii. 43.

struction.

struction.—This, I imagine, is very notorious, that OUR SAVIOUR here, in the prospect of a near-approaching death, makes use of the same form of expression, with that used by St. Stephen under the like circumstances. The one saying: FATHER, *into thy hands I commend my spirit*. And the other: LORD JESUS *receive my spirit* *. If the latter then, namely, Stephen, be universally allowed to have intended by that word [spirit] the same rational intelligence, with what we call soul, and by which the human species is essentially distinguished from the brute-creation: is there not then parity of reason to conclude, that OUR blessed SAVIOUR made use of the same term, in reference to a spiritual substance animating his body, of the same nature or kind with Stephen's, and with that, which is common to our nature? If this be not demonstratively clear, I conceive, it will be impossible to ascertain the true meaning of any one expression, be it ever so familiar: and, consequently, that we must, at once, be obliged to confess, that language has nothing in it truly ideal. But to wave that,

VII. ANOTHER medium in our favour, may be taken from *those powers, affections and passions*, which we find peculiar to the human reasonable spirit. For having, by the preceding head, got possession of this existence itself, as the real substratum or basis of the man; our next step, in order, will be, that we endeavour to inform ourselves (as well in

* Acts vii. 59.

consequence of the preceding particulars, as in farther support of the main argument;) what are the faculties, powers and innocent affections of this reasonable soul; and to inquire, whether every thing of this kind be not expressly attributed to OUR LORD, in proof of his actually possessing an intelligent spirit of the same nature and rank. Here then we may observe,

I. IN the first place, that OUR SAVIOUR appears to have been the subject of erudition, on the same principles and in the same manner with ourselves.

WHEN I speak of OUR LORD as the subject of erudition, I would, by no means, be understood to suggest, that I imagine, he had, what we call a learned education among *the Jews*; either by sitting at the feet of any of their doctors as a regular pupil, or by his being enter'd as a student in any of their schools of the prophets: it being very certain that, in this sense, he *knew not letters*, having never learn'd in the one, or the other of these methods¹. On the contrary, what I intend, by indulging myself the present mode of expression, is merely this: that OUR SAVIOUR undoubtedly possess'd those several powers and faculties, which render'd him capable of instruction. [Powers, described by your lordship with great judgement and accuracy, in the former part of *Your Essay*:] and, consequently, that there is from hence sufficient

¹ John vii. 15.

reason to conclude, that he was animated by the same reasonable principle, with what constitutes the spirit or soul of man.

As it will then be remember'd, that what I am here especially concern'd to prove is *the humanity* of CHRIST, and not his DIVINITY [tho' we shall find an inseparable connexion between them ;] I shall therefore give no offence, I hope, by observing, that we cannot consider OUR blessed SAVIOUR as the subject of instruction, without pre-supposing that there was once a time, when he was so circumstanced, as to be wholly destitute of that knowledge, which we suppose him to have acquir'd by education. Wherefore it will be necessary, in our first setting-out, to inform ourselves, whether there be proper foundation in holy scripture for a supposition of this kind. And in this particular, I apprehend, we need no other testimony, than that given us by St. *Luke*, where he tells us, that JESUS *increased in wisdom*¹. Which, I suppose, plainly intimates, that he possess'd a lesser measure of it in the preceding years of his life ; till, we may, at last, by carrying our thoughts back to the article of his birth, be allowed to conclude, that there was a total absence of this wisdom.

THE METHOD of accounting for this seems to be the difficulty. Here, therefore, it is not suppos'd, that CHRIST was ever destitute of the seeds of knowledge ; or that he wanted

¹ Ch. ii. 52.

those faculties, which are properly the seat of it ; much less, that the union, which originally subsisted between the man CHRIST, and THE DIVINE BEING, was broken off or dissolv'd : but only, that he had not, as a mere infant, the exertion, or command of those faculties for external use. The reason of this, I imagine, will be very intelligible, when it is only remember'd (for I cannot but think, I have prov'd it beyond contradiction in another place¹;) that OUR SAVIOUR did actually pre-exist in his human spirit from everlasting, or before all worlds : therein constituting both the real man [the soul being the man ;] and, including the circumstances under which he did pre-exist, THE ONE MEDIATOR between God and men. But it being necessary for the purposes of our salvation, that he should be cloth'd with a body, and appear among us in the other branch of our nature ; how easy is it to conceive, that this pre-existent spirit must necessarily come under such a change by it's confinement so long in the womb of the virgin, and by it's being imprison'd in a body of fleshy organs, through which alone it could now act ; that it must not only have lost or forgot all former notices of things ; but that it must also, of course, exert all it's operations, and attain all it's knowledge in the same way with ourselves ; that is, by application made thro' the gross medium of the body ? And

¹ See SERMONS, intitled the doctrine of CHRIST pre-existing his state of incarnation, &c.

therefore,

therefore, again, that it must be the subject of instruction, and gain both it's first intelligence, and *this increase in wisdom* by the same methods common to ourselves? Making allowance, however, for that difference, which must of necessity obtain in our nature, as perfect or fallen; to say nothing, at present, either of it's alliance to THE DEITY residing within, or of any extraordinary influence, that presence might occasionally afford.

AND were it only, that this gives us a remarkable view of OUR LORD's exinanition, and his amazing abasement of himself, as man; I should think, this were reason sufficient to assure us, that the present is a true state of the case. For as he was *in all things to have the pre-eminence*¹, and therefore, undoubtedly, pre-existed in his human spirit; and as that human spirit was originally the tabernacle of THE DIVINE BEING², and consequently, could not but be fill'd with *all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge*³: nor so only, but as it was, moreover, by virtue of this inhabitation, both intitl'd to, and actually honour'd with, the adoration of all the angelical host⁴: as this, I say, appears to have been the original constitution and essential glory of CHRIST, pre-existing in his human spirit or soul *from everlasting*⁵: so, I cannot see, what can give us

¹ Col. i. 18.

² Ibid. ver. 19. and ch. ii. 9.

³ Ibid. ver. 3.

⁴ Ibid. ch. i. 16. Heb. i. 5—9.

⁵ Prov. viii. 22, 23. Col. i. 15, 18. Rev. iii. 14.

either

either a clearer or stronger idea of OUR LORD'S *emptying himself*¹, even as man, than the circumstances he must be obliged to subject himself to by the present representation of things. Because by this, we are led to behold him as consenting to wave every pretension, even to dignity as well as understanding; tho' our present business is with the latter only. Here therefore we behold him willing to deposite [as to use and appearance, at least] that vast fund of wisdom, which he originally shar'd; and consenting to let it lie buried, as it were, a certain space of time; that is, till the organs of the body, he had assum'd, should be in a proper condition, as well to receive intelligence from without, as to render him capable of exerting the reasonable faculties essential to him as man. Nor is this all: but we here likewise behold him freely giving up his right to all the transcending advantages of THE indwelling GODHEAD; consenting particularly, in regard of knowledge, to an intire suspension of all divine influence on his birth; and that, afterwards, THE DEITY should only open itself upon him occasionally, and in such proportions, as his growth in stature, and the other circumstances of his life, should require.

WHEREFORE to lose this view of things, is, I humbly apprehend, to drop a considerable part of OUR LORD'S humiliation, in regard more precisely to his character, as man. For let it be consider'd: What an abasement was

¹ Phil. ii. 7. *Εαυτὸν ἐκένωσε.*

here!

here! What a thorough exinanition! That from one, who, in his original state, lay *in the bosom of THE FATHER*¹, and was acquainted with all the counsels of the divine breast; nay, that from one, who was absolutely the seat of all knowledge universally, as being *THE LOGOS, THE WORD of GOD*²; the person in whom the fountain of divine wisdom resided, and from whom it, at first, broke forth in the several works of creation: that from being all this, he would readily and freely submit to such a confinement in the womb; such an entrance on human life, and such attendant circumstances, as should intirely strip him of ALL preceding advantages; evident, however, particularly in this: that by the present change of condition, he should not only be divested of his original stock of wisdom, or, at least, depose the exercise of all his reasonable powers; but that he should also be laid under a necessity of learning every thing, as we, the lower branches of the nature, apparently do; I mean, by observation and reflection. What a miracle of humility is this! [Reserve being still made to him of his intimate relation to DEITY, and of the peculiar attending his personal structure, both as to body and mind: of which hereafter.]

I DARE not, indeed, pretend to say that, in point of *forgetfulness*, it would not have been the like with regard to a super-angelical intelligence; supposing that intelligence ob-

¹ John i. 18.

² Ibid. ver. 1.

liged

liged to act thro' the same medium with ourselves, and taking that medium under the same disadvantageous circumstances, which attend the new-born infant. Nay, it certainly must have been thus, in the absolute nature of the thing, all voluntarily consent here being out of the question: But, tho' I should allow this, I cannot, however, imagine that, the cases would have been parallel, in regard to *the acquisition of knowledge*. Because I cannot, as yet, allow myself to think, that external objects would have struck a nature of that kind in the same way with our own; nor, consequently, that he would have form'd the same comparison of things, or have had exactly the same assemblage of ideas with ourselves; which, yet, it must be allowed, are conditions quite necessary to his receiving intelligence from without, and to his reasoning or infering from that intelligence, in our manner.

If the principle giving rise to this difficulty, be ask'd, it is evidently this: that effects are always proportionate to the causes, by which they are produc'd. Consequently, therefore, a super-angelical spirit possessing, in it's private construction, capacities greatly superior to those of the human nature; the rational faculties of such super-angelical intelligence would operate in a different manner from ours; and therefore this exalted spirit, having a more extensive view of things, and forming other combinations of images, than what a spirit merely human can, at any rate, admit of;

must of necessity have greatly the advantage of our nature in all the discursive operations of the mind ; and, consequently, excel us, both in the means of acquiring knowledge, and in the perfection, to which it would rise. For the difference here, absolutely turns on the superiority of the intelligent substance, and not on the organization of the body. Because, be the spirit within human or super-angelical, the organization, in the present case must be allowed perfectly finish'd .— Wherefore to suppose an intelligence merely human, capable of the same exalted attainments with one super-angelical, or be it angelical only [an order of creatures, who are said to excel in *wisdom* as well as *strength*² ;] would be to disturb that beautiful gradation, which THE ALMIGHTY has establish'd thro' the several divisions of his works ; the consequence of which is, that one species of existence stands invariably distinct from the rest : so that an inferior order can by no means infringe on the capacities and province of a superior, without

¹ It is necessary to observe here, that I proceed on this plan of reasoning, not that I believe the fact, or, indeed, the possibility of it : I mean, that an angelical, much less a super-angelical spirit, can be united to a system of organized matter, like the human body : believing, on the contrary, that every spirit has it's own body, and that it can no more pass it's barrier in regard to that organical disposition of matter, which serves it as a body ; than it can break thro' the rank of it's essence, as a spirit of this, or the other particular species. But, I here admit the supposition, for the sake of reasoning upon it ; to let others see, how far it is from serving the purpose, for which it is set up.

² Pl. ciii. 20. 2 Sam. xiv. 17, 20.

destroying the whole scale of being.—It is on a principle of this sort, that our poetical oracle, the inimitable Mr *Pope*, introduces the angelical world contemplating that great philosopher Sir *Isaac Newton*, as a prodigy of human nature; breaking in, as it were, so much on their own order, that he tells us with equal spirit and propriety :

They shew'd a NEWTON, as we shew an Ape¹.

THE ABOVE then being absolute matter of fact, on supposition of a super-angelical nature informing a human body²; who sees not, how foreign every thing of this kind must be to the true state of the present question, as it rises to view from our BIBLE? Because, if the account of CHRIST'S *increasing in wisdom*, be not suited to our own circumstances from infancy to manhood; and therefore design'd to inform us, that OUR LORD (in the general, at least) acquir'd his knowledge in the same way with ourselves, that is, as was said above, by

¹ ESSAY ON MAN, B. II. l. 34.

² If it be not admitted, that a super-angelical spirit has eminently the advantage of a human spirit, in the same body, respecting the acquisition of knowledge, &c. the alone consequence must be, that this super-angelical spirit retains no longer his original dignity or rank, but becomes, instantly, degraded to a level with the human reasonable creature. [It being a favourite principle with *The Essay*, in some parts of it, at least, to determine, the quality of the spirit merely, by the condition of the body it wears.] But to allow this (and yet the conclusion is very plain) would be to give up the argument to us at once. Because, in this case, his quality, as super-angelical, is only a name.

observation and reflection; I apprehend, I may venture to say, without incurring the censure of rashness, that it is apparently no revelation at all: that it must, indeed, be an abuse of words, and no other than a mockery on us. Because it is giving us the relation of a fact, concerning the nature of which, we have no possible medium to judge by; being as yet unacquainted with the effects, which would result from the conjunction of an human body and a super-angelical spirit. But so little reason is there, to admit a suspicion of this kind; I mean, to suppose the text in the least degree chargeable with imposture or obscurity; that upon a bare comparison of those parts in it, which stand opposed to each other, we shall find it as clear and positive in this account, as we can wish to have it. Witness only, it's declaring, at one and the same time, in respect to the different constituent parts of the man, that he *grew in stature*, as well as that *he increased in wisdom*. Plainly intimating a strict union between soul and body, and the mutual influence of the one upon the other, as common to ourselves. Wherefore, as I cannot but conclude from the former part of this account, that he had a true human body; so there appears to me, equal reason for concluding from the latter part of it, that he had likewise a corresponding reasonable soul. The indications or marks are, I think, on both sides, equally strong and pertinent.

AGREE-

AGREEABLE with this Dr *Doddridge*, in his paraphrase on the 40th verse of this second chapter of St. *Luke*, tells us, that OUR LORD “*was educated at Nazareth, under the Care of Joseph and his Mother.*” But what is this education, if it does not suppose, at the least, that he was taught to read, and, in consequence of the command given by God himself to the body of that people¹, instructed, as other children were, in the principles of the *Jewish* religion? Or, to put it in other words, what does this education intend, if it be not, that application was made to his understanding, memory, reflection, and the rest, by some of those outward means, which are common among ourselves in the institution of youth?

BESIDES, the blessed JESUS appears to have been a learner only, and not a disputer, as some have imagin’d; at the very time that he is said to be found *sitting in the midst* of the *Jewish* doctors in the temple: ² *this sitting in the midst* of them [the tenderness of his age, and the design of their attendance, duly consider’d;] intending no more than his placing himself, together with others, their disciples or auditors on that occasion, on a seat or bench at the feet of the rabbins, who were seated yet higher in a semicircular form; with a view of being examin’d by them, and of asking them such questions as he might judge proper for his farther information in the divine law; this being the profess’d end of those

¹ Deut. vi. 7. and xi. 19.

² Luke ii. 46.

assemblies, and the precise business on which young persons attended them'.——Or, taking the words [*they found him — sitting in the midst of the doctors*] in the most extensive sense possible, the farthest we can carry the supposition, is : that as JESUS had distinguish'd himself by his questions and answers above the other young persons then attending; the doctors, charm'd with his superior sense, took him up and seated him amongst themselves; both with a design of shewing him greater respect, and of conversing more freely with him. But that he was a disputant on this occasion, and not an inquirer, or catechist, is certainly to represent matters in a light highly injurious to OUR SAVIOUR's character as a youth of modest, ingenuous deportment; and, for that reason, can never be the design of the place.

WHEREFORE, making the proper use of the above representations, I own, I know not how to reconcile myself to an observation made by *Erasmus* on this account of OUR LORD's *increasing in wisdom*, when he says : that “ all the Endowments of the *Man, Christ Jesus* “ were owing to the Divine Beneficence, and “ that the *Deity* communicated itself in a “ gradual manner to that Human Nature “ which it had assum'd ”². The latter part, indeed, is very intelligible (as we shall see more fully below;) but if by the former part he means [for it is in this sense, the words

¹ See Dr. *Doddridge's* paraphrase and notes on verse 46.

² Ibid. ver. 52, note (b).

present themselves to me ;] that OUR LORD in the acquisition of knowledge, speaking of it in the general, was not the subject of human instruction ; or, which is the same thing, stood exempt from the application of the reasonable powers essential to him as man ; and therefore derived his whole stock of natural wisdom by inspiration or miracle ; if this be the meaning of what is there said : I confess, as I can by no means believe the observation itself to be *just* ; so neither can I call it *important* ; tho' Dr. *Doddridge* is pleased to compliment him upon it in those terms. But of this likewise again, before I dismiss the argument.

TAKING it then for granted from the process here given, that OUR LORD inform'd his mind and enlarg'd his ideas (in a measure, at least) on our own plan ; and, consequently, that the scriptural accounts of this matter (that especially, on which we here sat out) are all level to our understanding : I see immediately sufficient ground to conclude, and hope it will appear with equal evidence to your lordship, that OUR SAVIOUR certainly shared a reasonable intelligence or soul, of the same nature and rank with our own.

IF it should be objected to this, that OUR LORD discover'd a measure of knowledge and wisdom greatly above his years, when he put such questions to the *Jewish* doctors, and return'd such answers to their questions, as fill'd both them, and the audience in general, with transports of admiration. What we have to

observe by way of reply, is, as follows: namely, that there are two considerations, which will fully account for this, and every other specimen, which OUR LORD might give, of a superior genius thro' his minority: tho' they are likewise to be allow'd their part, and a considerable one too, through the more advanc'd years of his life.

I. FIRST then, to all the advantages he might enjoy as an human spirit of the most finish'd kind (meaning, as finish'd, as that nature will bear, without entering into the dispute, whether there are degrees in this branch of intelligent beings; that, besides every advantage of this sort) we must remember to add not only, that he, undoubtedly, shar'd *the most perfectly organized body* [which is allowed on all hands, to be of great consequence, respecting the operations of the mind;] but also, that he receiv'd that body in a state of *absolute purity*. In consequence of this, it is not only to be observ'd, that there was nothing in CHRIST's whole structure to clog or obscure the operations of his mind; but again, on the contrary, that there was the presence of every thing, that could possibly assist and heighten those operations. And these were advantages, that would grow up with him; his mind giving still brighter evidences of it's force and penetration, as the organs through which it acted, became more adapted to support those discoveries. Take a view of him therefore in a state of maturity, and this

as a man only ; we immediately judge of his extensive capacities, by what is observable of *Adam*, during the innocent period of his life, in that amazing particular of his looking into the very essence of the creatures, as they pass'd in review before him, and giving them severally such names as were expressive of their distinct natures. But that is only the former observation, for we are also to know,

2. THAT in respect of CHRIST, as a man, he was *the tabernacle* of the DIVINE BEING himself, and therefore originally possess'd of an immeasurable unction of divine gifts and graces ; the presence and energy of which (as we observ'd above) was to be gradually display'd ; as the necessary occasions turn'd up in the progress of his life. Wherefore, under a circumstance of this kind, who can pretend to bound the proportions, in which THE DIVINITY within, might choose to discover itself on particular seasons ? More or less of this influence, undoubtedly, obtain'd from his being first capable of observation and action, down to that grand event of his offering himself, through THE ETERNAL SPIRIT, *without spot upon the cross*¹.

AND to assure us, that what has been now advanced under this, and the preceding head, has proper countenance from sacred history ; I imagine, we need only take in the testimony given us by St. *Luke*, at the 40th verse of this second chapter, where we have these words :

¹ Heb. ix. 14.

And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom; and the grace of GOD was upon him. Now, this is an account of the blessed JESUS while yet quite young, even before his attaining the twelfth year of his age. And what does it suggest in it's different parts? First, his increase as to bodily stature, *the child grew.* Secondly, the early force of his natural genius [or, that, however, in part;] *and waxed strong in spirit:* giving early proofs of a superior natural sagacity; it being therefore added that, in this respect, he was *filled with wisdom.* And then, over and above all these natural advantages, which more especially belonged to him as man; it is observed farther, in the last place: *and the grace of GOD was upon him:* meaning, without doubt, those extraordinary influences, which arose, more immediately, from the divine beneficence; and were such as gave intimations, that he was a peculiar favorite of heaven; being therefore indulg'd those communications of wisdom, and that superiority in virtue, which are by no means common to the human nature.

THESE then, I apprehend, are observables, which perfectly well account for every thing, that was extraordinary in OUR SAVIOUR, whether as to genius or manners; without throwing us on a necessity of supposing, that his spirit was super-angelical, rather than human. And therefore, if *The Arians* have, in any measure, been tempted to adopt that hypothesis, on account of those early proofs, which he gave,

gave, both of a surprizing capacity for knowledge, and a flaming zeal for morality ; such a system, however, appears quite unnecessary on the principles exhibited by these last heads. Because, considering him only as a branch of human nature in the highest degree of perfection, and as standing in the closest connexion with DEITY itself ; here is a proper basis laid for the most distinguishing excellencies of both kinds, without obliging us, in the least, to suppose him of a different species from ourselves. For, as we see, on the one hand, to what an exalted pitch natural understanding obtain'd in *Adam* ; so, we cannot pretend to limit the divine influence, on the other : allowing THE indwelling GODHEAD to be at liberty to wave his influence, or operate, as he should see fitting.—No wonder, however, that CHRIST, with such a peculiar constitution, and under such a remarkable circumstance, should, from the first, be qualified for the heights of knowledge and virtue : and that he should absolutely give such singular instances of both, as were greatly superior to his own age, consider'd as man ; and to what is to be met with in the other branches of the human nature, consider'd in *their fall*.

IF we inquire, indeed, more strictly into the precise manner, in which his discursive faculties operated, while making these singular advances in knowledge ; it must be confess'd, I imagine, that tho', in the general, they cannot but be suppos'd to bear a near resemblance

semblance to the operations of our own minds in researches purely intellectual, as acting by the same common medium or springs; yet is there a prodigious difference to be allowed, not only in consequence of our last particular [the inhabitation of THE GODHEAD;] but even in reference to the peculiar advantages inseparable from his structure as man, by virtue of the other particular: a constitution of this kind immediately telling us, that he must of necessity be exempt from all the embarrassment of those tedious and painful deductions, we are obliged to undergo in our state of darkness and imperfection; and that, on the contrary, he could not but take a commanding survey of things, at once. And, therefore that, as they presented naked and undisguis'd to view; so, he could not but enter into an acquaintance with them by an easy, familiar application of mind.

NOR yet is this, possibly, the whole, that we are to take with us in adjusting the present head. For, as there is certainly a distinction between those faculties and powers, which are absolutely essential to the reasonable soul; and those, which are rather for ornament and dignity: so, it is not, at all, unnatural to suppose that, on particular occasions at least, it might please THE ALMIGHTY to let in so much light upon the man, CHRIST JESUS, over and above what was properly essential to his spirit as man; as to give him, indeed, an intuitive view of things: in which respect also,

it

it may again be said of him, that he *was filled with wisdom*. And, in this account of the matter, I can readily concur with *Erasmus*, as quoted above: instantly allowing, that ALL his endowments of this kind, were merely the effect of the divine beneficence. But then (taking in this view of things, as necessary to complete the present question) ALL our SAVIOUR's endowments, however; the total of them, can by no means be said to terminate here; but those only, which were super-added for ornament-sake, and which, undoubtedly, for that reason, may well be charged to the account of especial benignity, or free favour, in THE ALMIGHTY. And on this principle of reasoning, I am ready to think, that we shall likewise be obliged to make *Adam* a debtor to the same divine beneficence, for a portion of his superlative knowledge: I mean, that, in particular, by which he saw into the very substance of the creature, and impos'd names in absolute conformity with the natures they possess'd.

HOWEVER, after having made the necessary abatements of this kind; the account, I imagine, in the general, must at last return to the same point, where we left it above: namely, that OUR LORD, considered as man, was, certainly, a subject of education, as we are; and, therefore, possessing the powers and capacities suited to instruction and reflection; he must be, undoubtedly, of the same intelligent nature

ture with ourselves. Which was the thing to be prov'd.

WE have then, in what has been suggested under this head [tho' it has stretch'd itself much beyond my intentions ;] an account of OUR SAVIOUR'S general capacity as an human reasonable soul : demonstrable from his having a common interest in those faculties and powers, which bespeak us creatures of that precise constitution or order.——From generals then, we naturally descend to particulars. These too are at hand, being such only as arise from the human spirit itself, as it falls under the common distribution of *understanding*, *will*, and *affections*. And that the arguments, arising from this exhibition of the human intelligence or mind, will farther unite in giving evidence against your lordship's hypothesis, there is this good reason to conclude : namely, that whatever is true of the whole, must likewise hold good of the parts. Wherefore to begin with

I. THE FITST of these heads, that is, with what we call *the understanding*; by which, I would be understood to mean, not barely that operation of the mind, which is called perception ; but also, the judgment we form, and the conclusions we draw, in consequence of that perception. Or, in other words, by the understanding, in this place, I intend the amount of our whole observation and reflection ; the point, in which we fix, after we have view'd things in every light, and examin'd them by every relation.

Now

NOW, that the case here, between CHRIST, as a man only, and ourselves, as intelligent creatures of that order, is exactly parallel, will appear from hence : namely, that as he, in his incarnate state, received all his intimations, as man, thro' the same organs or senses with ourselves, and had directly the same perception of things, because possess'd of the same reasonable powers, that constitute our intelligent part : so, it follows, from the nature of the thing, that, in collecting the general evidence for the agreement or disagreement of his ideas, he could not but give into the same conclusions, or form the same final determinations, as would follow among ourselves, were the mind always qualified to make a just estimate of things.—Where the instruments for the reception of intelligence, and the faculties, operative in forming a judgment upon it, are precisely of the same nature [and that they are such in the present case, I would hope, has been prov'd to satisfaction above ;] there, undoubtedly, the sentiments will perfectly tally, and the decision, at last, terminate in the same point of knowledge.

THAT the understanding must be finite, is readily allow'd ; and for this good reason, that man, who is the subject of it, cannot be otherwise. And thus would it be too, were a super-angelical nature taken into the account, or the most exalted creature whatever. Because, as your lordship very justly remarks, there can be but ONE GOD, the supreme,
self-

self-existent being, exempt from limitation ¹.
Again,

2. IF we consider the direction under which OUR SAVIOUR'S *will* acted, as man ; or the influence, which gave it this, or the other particular bias ; we shall see farther reason to conclude, that the spiritual existence within, was of the same nature and rank with our own. This, I apprehend, is merely a consequence of the preceding head. For, allowing that OUR SAVIOUR received his intelligence, collated ideas, and concluded from them, in the same way with ourselves ; it evidently follows : that he could not but fall upon the same methods of forming his choice, and therefore must, of course, submit his will in the same manner, with ourselves. As the will is apparently under the government of the understanding, so the direction it takes, always comports with the determinations of the judgment. This [the judgment] therefore, in CHRIST, being evidently form'd on that view of things, which is peculiar to an human spirit ; the other [the will] of necessity resigns to the dictates, which arise from the judgment of such a rational agent : in which the influence determining the will, appears to be the same both in CHRIST and us.

ON the other hand, not to suppose, that OUR LORD made his choice in the same way and on the same principles, with ourselves, would be to put the dictates of his will under

a different direction from what they, at present, appear to have been under, by the account of holy scripture. Because, if it is possible for us to judge, when the spiritual existence thinks, reasons and chooses, as an human spirit does; we may be positive, that OUR LORD perform'd all these actions in the same way with ourselves. Not to allow this, would oblige us to assert, contrary to all experience, that we are wholly to seek in the several operations of our own minds.——But to subject the dictates of OUR LORD's will to a contrary direction, to that of our own, would be to alter the whole texture of his mind, and, consequently, diversify the whole tenor of his life. Because, if intelligencies of a superior nature to our own (as was argued above) are not suppos'd to act in consequence of their superior qualities, to what purpose serve those superior qualities? or, why are they allow'd them? But, as it is certain, that every being must act in proportion to it's faculties; and that super-angelical beings have faculties greatly superior to ours: so, to suppose that CHRIST was animated by such an intelligent spirit, is, in my humble opinion, to suppose, that his thoughts and actions were, and could not but be, as different from ours, as such intelligence is superior in rank to that, which is merely human.

BUT as the whole of this appears to contradict all, that is said of OUR LORD, whether in regard to the faculties of his mind, or the

actions of his life, so far as we can judge of them ; it will not, I hope, be unpardonable in me to affirm : that the present can never pass for the true state of the question. — An example, however, may, probably, throw farther light on this part of the argument. Let it then be that of OUR LORD's submission to authority, even human as well as divine. [For as man, he had not only *a limited understanding*, but also *an obedient will*.] Now then, if the seat of this were not a mind of the same frame and order with our own, from whence can we derive his inducements to obedience, his chearfulness and constancy in it, and the manifest satisfaction and delight, he drew from it ? Were there no relation subsisting between him and the human nature, but what center'd in the body only ; and were he in other respects (those particularly which distinguish the nature) in alliance with an higher order of beings ; what could dissolve his obligations to their laws, and subject him to an observance of ours ? Unity of relation necessarily includes conformity in obedience. Wherefore, as CHRIST obey'd as we do ; it seems, likewise, a good reason, why we should suppose him in the same relation. If this be not the real matter of fact, how are we to account not only for his subjection to his natural, reputed parents, and to the authority of the *Roman* government ; but also to the whole body of those laws, which were originally framed for our nature, and therefore, particularly adapted to our circumstances

cumstances as men? [Because, we shall have occasion to speak of his obedience to heaven under a following head: I say, how are we to account for the whole of this?] I confess, I see only this one, plain method of doing it: namely, that OUR LORD had the same sentiments of relation and duty, which we have, and that he look'd upon himself as equally the subject of them, with ourselves. But this, I apprehend, he could no otherwise do, than as he was first absolutely conscious to his possessing the same nature with us; and had therefore a mind previously disposed for the observing all obligations, natural and civil.

THE only objection, as far as I can see, to which the above reasoning can be supposed liable, is this: namely, that it will be said, the super-angelical nature acts, in this case, by deputation or commission. But that nothing of this kind can possibly take place in the present argument, we shall have an opportunity of seeing, when we come to consider the nature of the obedience, which heaven requires, and, consequently the connexion, that must here obtain between the intelligence obeying, and the laws, to which he becomes obedient. For this, I suppose, will be allowed, that an absolute suitableness, on each part, is certainly fundamental to the obedience paid by OUR SAVIOUR [acting, however, in that quality.] For to suppose a superior nature obliged to the laws of another, it's inferior; would be, I imagine, to break-in upon the reason and fit-

ness of things, and to destroy that congruity or proportion in government, which infinite wisdom is always careful to maintain. So that, were this the case, there would necessarily follow, both a compulsion on the will of the person obeying (which must destroy the notion of submission;) and a real unfitness in his constitution to yield the obedience requir'd. For, whatever may be said, as to angels presiding over kingdoms, or the like, &c. we shall immediately see, that there is a vast disproportion between governing over us, and obeying for us: or, if that do not please, between their giving laws to the human nature, or enforcing those given it by heaven; and their being themselves bound down to the strict observance of those same laws. But then

3. TAKE we now a view of *the affections, and passions, or innocent weaknesses* of the human mind; such, in particular, as OUR LORD'S history assures us, he felt himself, while a sojourner among us in the flesh. Now as a preparatory both to this view itself, and also the proof, we promise ourselves from it, it may not be improper to observe, what your lordship is pleased to suggest in reference to
 “ some Spirits *so embodied, as that they may*
 “ be capable of receiving and communicating
 “ to each other Ideas of bodily Pain and bodily Pleasure, as well as intellectual Pain
 “ and intellectual Pleasure: *And farther, that*
 “ they may have their Affections and their
 “ Passions as well as we; their Friendships
 “ and

“ and Animofities, their Wars and Alliances”.
 [It is then to be prefumed, by the greater part
 of this account, that thefe fpirits are no longer
 in poffeffion of their original, created purity;
 but that they have fome how or other, fuf-
 fer’d a malignant perversion of nature. For the
 texture of their bodies and the temper of their
 minds feem to be at great variance. But
 leaving that, to be accounted for, as it may,
 we pafs on to the remaining part of the period,
 for it follows;] “ none of which, however, we
 “ can form any real Idea, or Notion of, for
 “ Want of the fame Kind of Senfes, which
 “ they are furnifh’d with” &c.

Now the whole of the above difference be-
 tween us and them (which is, neverthelefs,
 very great) your lordfhip is pleas’d to charge
 to the account of organized matter only, with-
 out paying the leaft regard to their rank in the
 fcale of intelligent powers: a matter, rather
 the more wonderful, becaufe you acknowledge
 “ an infinite feries of fpiritual agents” in a gra-
 “ dual defcent”. But taking that principle in-
 to the eftimate, as well as the general nature of
 things, may I not be allowed to fuppofe (for
 the proof of it here, would too much inter-
 rupt the main argument) that when AL-
 MIGHTY GOD created this infinite feries of
 fpiritual agents, he, likewife, at the fame time,
 created an equal number of bodies proper to
 this feries; bodies intirely adapted to the indi-

¹ *Essay*, § xxxi.
 § xxvii, xxxvi.

² *Ibid.* cxiv.

³ *Ibid.*

viduals of each species? So that, body answering to spirit, and spirit to body, they might so far reflect light, the one on the other, that where we observe a different external organization of body; there we may also justly conclude, that there is a different spiritual intelligence dwelling within, exactly suited to that particular disposition of body.

FOR, in regard to what your lordship has thought fit to advance, concerning spirits of the same species, taking *different setts* of material organs, and possessing different abilities, merely, in consequence of such *different setts* of organized matter¹; I may take an opportunity, of considering that doctrine, God willing, with some other things in reference to SPIRIT, at large, in a future letter. Only observing here, for present satisfaction in the point, that a principle of that kind is absolutely subversive of all order in general; both in respect of intelligent beings, and in respect of organized matter, produced, we may suppose, in gradual ascent, as mechanism for the individuals of this, or the other, peculiar species of spirit. But to return:

THE USE then, which I would beg leave to make of the above principle (here, only supposed for the present) is this: namely, that as there are superior orders of intelligent beings, with that curious contexture of body, and those singular perfections of mind, which we can form no true judgment of, and which,

¹ *Essay*, § xxvi.

yet,

yet, serve to distinguish them into their respective classes, and restrain them to their several proper spheres of action: I repeat it, as this appears to be the matter of fact, with respect to intelligent agents above us; so, by the rule of analogy or proportion, we may reasonably be allowed to conclude, that wherever we find an exact resemblance of body and mind, meeting in any two or more intelligent beings of a lower species; there an intire sameness of nature, in both the constituent parts of their frame, cannot but obtain, as the alone point, from whence a correspondence of this kind can be derived. Or, to put it in other words: wherever *the same sensations, affections and passions* appear to be common to any number of intelligent creatures; there likewise, we have the highest reason to conclude, that *the seat* of those sensations, affections and passions is exactly the same for structure and kind. For instance, to bring it down to the point in hand: If we find, that OUR blessed SAVIOUR made his observations, and reasoned upon them, just as we do; and, in consequence of those operations, was conscious to the same emotions of joy, sorrow, fear, &c. as we are: surely, as these are matters, which either subsist in, or result from, that particular frame, which distinguishes the human species; we may from hence, with very good reason suppose, that he is made up of the same constituent parts with ourselves, even in respect of mind, as well as of body. There-

fore, in particular, sharing the same material organization of body, that he might be quite susceptible of the same impressions; and, consequently, suffer from them in the same way with ourselves. For this, I think, we may be sure of, if we can be sure that the scriptures are genuine; that CHRIST did actually feel the same emotions of love and hatred, desire and aversion, joy and sorrow, hope and fear, and, indeed, every affection, as we do, only *without sin*.

THE SINGLE question then is: What could be *the seat* of these several passions and affections?—We find his body [allowed] the same as our own. Why not then his soul too? If that were not the absolute fact, how could his body have had precisely the same influence upon his mind, as our bodies have upon minds truly human? Or, how could any thing but a mind truly human, have received the same impressions from, or suffer'd the same emotions thro', a medium of the precise make of our bodies? The joint operations of both correspond. But whence this? Unless it be, that the intellectual principle itself, and the mechanism, by which it both acts and is acted upon, be one and the same.—I do not know, that there can be any better, that is, more certain method, for judging of the sameness of nature between two distinct substances, whether spiritual or material, separately; or whether both in conjunction; than that they are respectively found to possess the same distinguishing

stinguishing qualities; the qualities precisely essential to one and the same substance. For if properties are, in all respects, the same; such, undoubtedly, are the substances in which they inhere. If effects are exactly parallel, who would doubt, but that one and the same cause produc'd them? *Nothing*, as your lordship observes, *can act, where it is not* '. Consequently, therefore, there cannot be the effects peculiar to the operations of an human spirit, if such human spirit do not actuate the organs, with which those effects are connected. But, where the actions and affections are the same; it is highly reasonable to believe, that the agent and subject are the same, likewise. This then, is the present matter of fact. We do find such operations in the mind of CHRIST, and such passions arising from it, as exactly tally with things of the same nature in our minds: we therefore cannot but conclude, that the principle exciting those operations; the subject suffering those passions, is one and the same with our own; meaning, an human, and not a super-angelical spirit.

HOWEVER, it may not be amiss, if here again, after the method observ'd under a preceding head, we select some one particular instance for the illustration of the point; and the more extensive this, the more likely to give satisfaction. Here then, I can think of none more pertinent than that, which will lead us to consider OUR LORD as the subject of

temptations, that is, trials and sufferings. Because, as these include a general attack, as it were, on all the powers and faculties of his mind; so we shall, by this means, have an opportunity of observing it's operation in all it's different passions or emotions. What then are the scriptural accounts of this matter? I answer, these three:

1. FIRST, That he is said to *have been tempted in all points like as we are*¹.

2. SECONDLY, To *have suffered, being tempted*². And,

3. THIRDLY, as a consequence of both, it is declar'd concerning him: first of all, that he is still capable of *being touch'd with a sense of our infirmities*. And, in the next place, That *he is absolutely able to succour those, who are tempted*³.—Suffer me then, a brief examination of those several particulars. Wherefore to begin with

1. THE FIRST of them: namely, the declaration by which we are inform'd, that *he was in all points tempted like as we are*. Here two things are observable:

1.) THE UNIVERSALITY of OUR LORD'S temptations. Because it is said: he was tempted *in all points*: meaning, to the extent of every innocent infirmity; so far, as neither corruption within, nor irregularity without, had any share in his trials. For CHRIST was *without blemish* in the former respect, and with-

¹ Heb. iv. 15.

³ Ibid.

² Ibid. ch. ii. 18.

out spot in the latter. But, these exceptions being made, we, nevertheless, see plainly, that the whole man must be here concern'd, as the subject of the present affirmation. But if so, we must be oblig'd to take cognizance of his bodily weaknesses, as well as the inward conflicts of his mind.

WE behold him then, combating with hunger and thirst; with travail and fatigue; contradiction and contempt; or, in one word, with all the temptations and sufferings to which, either his character or circumstances subjected him, while conversant on our earth.—But, if we find all the trials, to which the whole man has ever been known subject, meeting together in CHRIST (making the exceptions above) can we, at any rate, suffer ourselves to doubt, that he really possess'd the two constituent parts of the man? Who sees not that, unless this be previously suppos'd, it is impossible, in the nature of the thing, that he should be the subject of these various temptations? This, however, will yet receive farther evidence, when we take with us

2.) THE OTHER part of the above account, giving us a distinct view of *the manner* in which he was handled by these complicated trials; it being subjoin'd, to complete the account, that he was tempted in all points *like as we are*.—Here is then an agreement in the manner of the thing, as well as in the express thing itself; whether we understand the terms

as meaning, that OUR LORD was as really and truly tempted as we are ; or that he was tempted in the same precise way ; by the same instruments or means [sin excepted ;] or to the same degree of violence. It was, it seems, *like as we are*. But a similitude in the manner, is a shrew'd reason, for a sameness in the subject. Because it can never, in strict propriety, be affirm'd of CHRIST, that he was tempted *like as we are*, unless he were inform'd by a spirit of that species, which made him like us in nature : since it is manifestly this structure alone, that can lay a proper foundation for his being affected in our manner ; or to a degree of sufferings equal to our own. But this brings us to

2. THE SECOND observable in the present account, which is, that *he suffer'd* from these temptations. Now from hence we are warranted to conclude, that he was not only attack'd by those very temptations, which are common to human nature ; but that they had actually the same effects upon him, as upon ourselves. We see here, therefore, the body of our temptations making head against him : nor so only, but we behold them both breaking-in upon him in the same manner, and likewise bringing-on the same conflicts of mind, they do upon ourselves. For example : equal perplexity and fear ; equal torture and grief. But what is the principle, that will account for this conformity of effects, if we separate the human spirit from his person ; and either
leave

leave him nothing but a body, or that animated by a super-angelical nature? both alike incapable of the present agonies, whether taken separately, or in conjunction. Come we now,

3. IN the last place, to examine *the remarkable consequence* of OUR LORD's subjecting himself to this cruel situation. And this is two-fold:

1.) FIRST, That he might be capable of *being touched with a feeling or sense of our infirmities*; meaning, all our innocent weaknesses. But how can we account for this, without supposing, that he has actually undergone these several infirmities himself? And on what principle shall we make that probable, without farther supposing, that he has certainly a spirit or mind of the same structure with our own; as that personal qualification, which could alone render him the subject of all these innocent weaknesses? It is, my lord, your own maxim, and that from which there will be no appeal, that *Nothing can act, where it is not*: if, therefore, OUR SAVIOUR has truly and properly the feeling of our several infirmities, so as to sympathize or condole with us under them; so as to be touch'd [tho' in a manner inexplicable to us] with a true sense of the temptations themselves, and feel a proper tenderness towards his suffering followers: it is evident, that he could no otherwise come under these conflicts at first; nor retain this sense of them now; but as he was originally form'd with both the constituent parts of our nature: the one to receive the impression, and fasten it
upon

upon him while here ; and the other to keep up such a just resentment from it, as is consistent with his present glorified state. But that is only the former part of what we have now under consideration. Wherefore

2.) THE OTHER, as the result of the whole, is, that he may be *able* to succour *those, who are tempted*. Hence then we observe an acquir'd ability ; a capacity, highly advantageous to the church, taking it's rise. He was tempted himself, and suffer'd by his temptations, that he might become abundantly qualified, not only to sympathize with his followers, as above ; but also, and especially, to provide them the necessary support under a circumstance of the like nature. Here then the inclination and power happily unite. But, who sees not, that an ability of this sort could not have been acquir'd by OUR LORD, if he had not been, for personal construction or make, the very same with ourselves ? For, as this ability necessarily presupposes, that he must have undergone the same struggles and sorrows with ourselves ; and those in the same precise manner, or with equal violence : so, does it likewise necessarily conclude that, in respect of his proper metaphysical nature, he must have been absolutely the same with ourselves ; as the alone constitution, that could have render'd him the seat of these trials and sufferings. The reason of this (agreeable to former observations) is absolutely founded in the nature of the thing. Because it is certain,

that

that no being can either act or suffer, in a manner or capacity appropriate to the human nature; and yet, at the same time, subsist without the verge of that nature.

NOT but we might likewise observe, that to deny this reasoning, would be, at once, to destroy *the intire drift* of the apostle in the text. Because it would be to assert that OUR SAVIOUR, instead of having either the inclination or power to serve us; instead of being capable either of sympathy on the one hand, or succour on the other; is so perfectly a stranger, if not to the materials of which we are composed, yet to the operation of the several powers and faculties of our soul; as neither to know how we are affected, nor [consequently] what are the proper means of applying for our support.

A SUPER-ANGELICAL nature, it is true, may be a witness to my various distress; may be sensible, that I am greatly embarrass'd; and, besides seeing my tears and hearing my groans, may, in some respect, if so commision'd, minister to a supply of bodily strength, or even suggest something for the relief of my mind; but when all this is done, he cannot, however, be said to share with me in the experience of these things: he cannot absolutely suffer or condole with me; he can never make my distresses his own. See then, how disproportionate the instrument, and therefore, how deficient the aid! But let an intelligence of our own species [under the proper qualifications]

tions] be concern'd, we may then be assur'd, that as the connexion is most intimate ; so, the supply will be admirably adapted. He is perfectly acquainted with all the avenues to our heart ; with every movement in the human soul. And as he has himself been attack'd by the same passages, and had violence offer'd to those very springs ; experience gives him, at once, both a sympathetic tenderness, and a capacity of applying to the cause itself. This sympathy then, is *his soul* (as giving him a quick sense of what he once suffer'd in the body ;) and as it is a sympathy *with us*, a feeling or sense of our own kind ; so, it undoubtedly proves, that he shares the same human spirit with ourselves.

BUT yet farther to support what has been now said, and, at the same time, give additional weight to the general argument ; there is another declaration made by our apostle, in this his second chapter to *the Hebrews*, which may be urged,

VIII. IN the next place, as a full and incontestible proof of CHRIST'S sharing true and proper humanity. The words, which I refer to are those, where he tells us, verse 17 : *That in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren.*

TO what, will it be said, does St. Paul here refer, as *the last instance* of OUR SAVIOUR'S conformity to the human nature ?——
To his assumption of a body. But wherefore
does

does he say, that it behoved him to be made *like unto his brethren*, in this particular?—Because he had laid hold of the seed of *Abraham*, the guilty descendants of *Adam*, and not the angelical nature; with a view to our recovery from the ruins of *the fall*: it being therefore necessary, that he should be *made of a woman*, and also *made under the law*¹; that he might be in a circumstance capable of answering the obligations, which the law had on the human nature. But why is the preference here given to the body? Or, why is that particular instance of conformity so expressly refer'd to in this place? The answer is: because it was the only remaining part of our nature, in which CHRIST was to be made *like unto his brethren* in the fulness of time. Is it farther ask'd: How does that appear? Because, in respect to the nobler part of the man, the soul; he was in full injoyment of that from everlasting. For it was in his pre-existent spirit, that THE ALMIGHTY *possess'd him in the beginning of his ways, before his works of old*². And why should we hesitate in this point? If it was the pleasure of THE FATHER, that CHRIST should sustain the meaner branch of our nature; what can possibly tempt us to think, that he had not likewise previous interest in the nobler branch of it?—Not to observe, how absurd it is to suppose, that he should assume that organized system of matter, which is peculiar to an hu-

¹ Gal. iv. 4.² Prov. viii. 22.

man spirit ; if he had yet never pre-existed his incarnation, as a spirit of that precise order.

BESIDES, where, or what, is *this likeness*, that St. Paul speaks of, between CHRIST and creatures of our composition ; if, after all, he be found to possess nothing of our nature ? For that may justly be said, if the reasonable soul, in which the distinction of nature eminently consists, were not strictly and properly HIS.—But if it was absolutely necessary, that he should be like us, *his brethren* ; and this in all the essentials of our nature ; surely, it was necessary, that he should be like us in that circumstance, which is principal or chief. Without this, What is the affinity ? Where is the relation ? Or, how come we to stand in the mutual capacity of *brethren* to each other ? For, should we not think him an odd sort of brother, who was a man only in body or appearance ; but who, in point of nature or essence, was a creature of super-angelical origin ? Wherefore, while our apostle peremptorily asserts, that it behoved him *in all things* [suited to his person and office] *to be made like unto his brethren* ; and we can be positive, that we are the subjects of that character ; we must be wanting to the grace of ALMIGHTY GOD, as well as our own dignity, not to conclude, that he truly possess'd a reasonable soul, as the necessary basis for supporting a body of our texture or make. And does not this lead us

IX. To account for OUR SAVIOUR's being so often, and so emphatically stiled *a man, the man, and the son of man*; and warrant us in calling-in those characters, as another argument in our favour? It is by these terms that OUR LORD stands described in a variety of places in scripture both before¹, and after his incarnation; the last of them, in particular [*the son of man*] is a character, that he was perpetually in the use of himself, during the period of his public ministry; as may be seen, at large, in the gospels. The question then is, Are these characters intelligible, or not? For, if they are of a different signification, when applied to OUR SAVIOUR, from what they are in common usage among ourselves; meaning, that if they are design'd to suggest, that CHRIST's spirit is super-angelical, but that ours is merely human; there is then, I think, a direct end of all language. For, if such a construction as this, be not a plain abuse of words, and a manifest imposition on our understanding, I know not, what is.—But as the other is a sense back'd by the common use of those words, and the scriptures condescend to speak in our own terms, because design'd for our instruction and consolation; and, moreover, as the interpretation comes strengthen'd by so many concurring testimonies; I imagine, we must not only fly in the face of revelation, but

¹ Gen. xxxii. 24. compared with Hosea, xii. 4, 5. Josh. v. 13. Pf. lxxx. 17. Dan. iii. 25. and vii. 13.

even divest ourselves of the common principles of reason; not to believe that, when CHRIST is call'd by these names, they are design'd to assure us, that he is a reasonable human intelligence, as well as ourselves. For (to recur to the old question) what a poor claim would a creature have to the character of *a man*, who was absolutely destitute of the distinguishing part of the man?

As to what is suggested on this head in favour of angels, from their appearing in *an human shape*, we shall have occasion to speak to it hereafter. Once more,

X. OUR LORD's *standing oppos'd to Adam*, or apparently answering to him, as *the anti-type* does to *the type*, is a farther reason for maintaining his true and proper humanity. That *Adam* and CHRIST are thus oppos'd, is, I think, expressly affirm'd by the apostle in those words: *Who [Adam] is the figure of him, that was to come* ¹ [CHRIST.] This passage then, speaking directly to the fact itself, the question proper upon it is this: Upon what accounts, or in what respects, was *Adam* a figure of CHRIST? The true answer to which, I apprehend, is, not barely as to the matter of universal dominion over the creatures, originally granted to *Adam*, and only, in it's extent, verified in CHRIST; nor yet farther, as to a general character of relation to mankind, if we consider each in the capacity of a father to his

¹ Rom. v. 14.

respective

respective seed ; but also, and principally, as to a similitude or identity of nature. Because, let us extend the resemblance, in other respects, to never so great a variety ; yet this correspondence of nature [as the parties here, are, on both sides, confessedly intelligent ;] I imagine, must be suppos'd a necessary pre-requisite. For, setting this aside, what foundation can there be, either for their relation to, or their exercising dominion over, us, the members of the human species ? Besides that, it is very certain, we can upon this principle, and this only, easily deduce their interest in those grand events, which distinguish the persons, and determine the eternal state of the human nature : by which I mean, in respect of *Adam*, that part, which he bears in the communication of natural life to us, and his having intail'd misery and death upon his descendants. It being therefore said, in reference to the one, that he was made *a living soul*¹ ; meaning, undoubtedly, that he was endued with an ability of propagating animal or natural life ; and, in reference to the other, that *in Adam we all died*². And, on the contrary, meaning, in respect of *CHRIST*, the part that he bears in the communication of spiritual life ; it being therefore said, that he was made *a quickening spirit*³ : which, I suppose, intends as well his giving us grace for the present, as his raising the bodies of the dead at the last day ; it being farther said on this account, that *in CHRIST we shall all be made alive*⁴.

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 45. ² Ibid. v. 22. ³ Ibid. v. 45. ⁴ Ib. v. 22.

THIS then, I observe, is the different relation they bear to us; this the different part they are found to act in the general concerns of the human species. And, as the resemblance in these respects, between *Adam* and CHRIST, appears to be exceeding strong; so, I cannot but suppose, as the best means of accounting for these particulars, that the foundation, on which this correspondence is built, is no other than a similitude or identity of nature; or, that this is the primary and radical idea of the present figurative connection between these two persons, *Adam* and CHRIST. — The subject, it is observable, is the same: namely, mankind, on both sides. And the head of the one, that is to say, *Adam*, is absolutely an human, reasonable creature; why not then the head on the other part of the same nature? For, is it possible, that *Adam* should be properly a figure or type of CHRIST, if CHRIST himself want that nature, wherein the resemblance must principally, or fundamentally, consist?

AGAIN: Upon what other principle shall we account for those words by the same apostle (still placing *Adam* and CHRIST in the like opposition:) *The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is THE LORD from heaven*? Here, it is plain, that St. Paul speaks of *Adam* and CHRIST, as tho' there were only *these two men* in the world: and very naturally and justly, considering them

1 Cor. xv. 47.

only

only as the general representatives of their respective seeds; the one, as was said above, natural, the other, spiritual. For, as all mankind apparently come under the present distribution of natural or spiritual; so may they properly be refer'd to one, or other, of *these two persons*; as the common root or fountain of their natures.

FOR the advantage, or preference, which is here given to OUR LORD, as the root of a new, that is, a divine nature, it evidently proceeds on this bottom [considering him barely as *a man*, because we are here confin'd to that precise article:] that he is THE LORD *from heaven*: a man, not of this world; not deriving his original, even as man, in our way: and therefore, whether he be considered, as *the temple* of the living GOD, or as *the high-priest* of his church; we are requir'd to look upon him, in respect of his person, as the perfection of our nature; and, in respect of his office, as acting *through a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building*¹: meaning, I presume, that tho' he be of our nature, yet, that he received it not in a way of ordinary generation.

AND this, again, I imagine, is the true and principal reason inducing OUR LORD to speak so frequently of himself in the days of his flesh, under the diminutive character of *the son of man*. It is the general name, by

¹ Heb. ix. 11.

which he speaks of himself. And wherefore? but to intimate, that he is *this second man*, THE LORD *from heaven*; and therefore precisely *that man*, or *that seed of the woman*, who, on the transgression of our first parents, was immediately promised, *to break the serpent's head*¹: the grand inference from which would be, that he is no other than THE true MESSIAH.

FROM hence then, I apprehend, it appears, that there is an intire connexion between *Adam* and CHRIST. Primarily, in their possessing one common nature, as the foundation of that interest they respectively share in the human reasonable species, and the common concern they have with them; the one in a natural, the other in a spiritual way: and, consequently, that OUR SAVIOUR is an human, and not a super-angelical SPIRIT.

XI. IT will appear, that OUR SAVIOUR is truly a man and no other, because *universal dominion* was originally promised to the human nature; and that promise is already, in part, and shall hereafter, in it's utmost extent, be fulfilled in the person of CHRIST only.

THAT the human nature, particularly in the person of OUR SAVIOUR, had the original grant of the present sovereignty [it being manifest, as St. *Paul* distinguishes in the case, *that HE ONLY is excepted, who did confer this*

¹ Gen. iii. 15.

*extensive prerogative*¹;] is abundantly clear from accounts to this purpose in the eighth Psalm. The words, which I refer to, are these: *When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the sun, which thou hast ordained: What is man, that thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that thou visitest him? For thou madest him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honour. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou hast put ALL things under his feet, &c*¹.

THE DECLARATION here in favour of the human nature is equally plain and peremptory. Nor will the application admit of any dispute, whether, in lower and more remote senses, we suppose the subject of the discourse to be the human species, collectively; *Adam* individually, or *David* figuratively: or, whether, in it's higher and last reference, Christians in general are intended; or rather, Jesus himself, as including his followers, and as being the antitype both of *Adam* and *David*; and, indeed, the head of the whole nature. For, it is certain, expositors have taken these different ways of interpretation: all, however, agreeing in this one point, that the human nature, and that only, is the express subject of the present exhibition.

IT is true that, to accommodate this subject, *man*, to the precise circumstances, in

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 27.

² Verse 3—6.

which

which he is here consider'd by *the Psalmist*, we are to contemplate him, in the lower application of the term; as rais'd, indeed, at first (tho' perfectly pure) from the crumbling particles of the earth; but as now, by reason of sin, greatly sunk from his original. And again: in the higher application of the word, that is, as it belongs to CHRIST; we must know, that we are to behold him, as employing himself for the great purposes of our salvation; and submitting, for a time, to all the finless infirmities and miseries introduced by *the fall*. The necessity of which double view is plainly this: namely, that these alone are the considerations capable of making proper way for that admiration, which *the Psalmist* here expresses, on observing the endearing methods by which the divine condescension and goodness exert themselves towards the inhabitants of our world.—But whatever sense of the word we here take, and in whatever light we consider this subject, the conclusion terminates in the same point, *man*. The human, reasonable creature is still the alone object in view; the centre and substance of the whole description; the true and sole nature originally invested with *the sovereign dominion* here spoken of.

WHEREFORE, we being thus, upon the interpretation above, supported by the concurring testimony of all expositors, quite certain in regard to our subject; and, by that means, fully assur'd, that the former part of the obser-

vation

vation at first laid down, is indisputably true; namely, that *man* is the dignified nature here intended: What farther remains, is, with the latter part of the observation, by which we are obliged to shew, that CHRIST is the alone person, in whom the accounts here given, can acquire their last and highest completion. The plain consequence of which must be, that he is truly a branch of the human nature; or, in other words, THAT MAN, and THAT SON OF MAN, here, primarily intended. Now this part of the argument will admit of full proof from the considerations following: viz.

I. BECAUSE St. Paul [he being generally suppos'd the author of the epistle to the *Hebrews*] expressly applies the accounts in this eighth psalm to OUR blessed SAVIOUR. His words are these: *But one in a certain place testified, saying: What is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man, that thou visitest him? Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; thou crownedst him with glory and honour, and didst set him over the works of thy hands. Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet. For in that he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing, that is not put under him. But now we see not yet [openly or visibly] all things put under him. But [as a leading, and remarkable step towards it] we see JESUS, who was made a little lower than the angels [answering therefore to the man, and the son of man, above] for the suffering*
of

*of death, crowned with glory and honour*¹; in his present exaltation at THE FATHER'S right-hand. What farther demonstration need we? Are we not here brought to a point? See we not here, both the person and dominion, we are speaking of, meeting in OUR LORD? And, consequently that, as he is eminently the subject of the description; so, he is likewise of the nature peculiar to that subject: to wit, human and not super-angelical? But the matter rests not here, great as the apostle of *the Gentiles* was, we have still the testimony of a greater. For I have to observe,

2. THAT no less person, than CHRIST himself, challenges the accounts of *this psalm* as his own peculiar. This he does by quoting the words at the second verse: *Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast thou ordained strength.* For, as they stand in close connexion with the other parts of *the Psalm*; so, they prove that the subject, throughout, is one and the same: meaning, the human nature, in this, or the other branch of it.—The present application was made by OUR LORD on occasion of the resentment which the chief priests and scribes expressed, on hearing even *children* (not to mention grown persons) crying out in the temple and saying: *Hosanna to the son of David.* For, upon this, they had insolence enough to say to him, in a malicious, upbraiding manner: *Hearest thou, what these say? Yea, says*

¹ Heb. ii. 6—9.

OUR LORD, have ye never read: out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise¹? Designing hereby to intimate, that THE ALMIGHTY would make use of the tongues of children, in the literal sense of the word; as well as those of the apostles and others his followers (who for their education and temporal circumstances, stood no higher in the opinion of the world) to witness to the character of HIS SON, as THE true MESSIAH: and, consequently, to this of his being THE universal LORD [in respect of his pre-existent spirit, at least] sent down from heaven².

HERE then, it is very observable, that the evidence, on all hands, perfectly tallies. *David* makes the subject of his discourse, throughout, *a man*, and *the son of man*: a branch of our own nature or species. *The individual* here eminently refer'd to, *St. Paul* tells us, is CHRIST; and to confirm the testimony of both, OUR LORD expressly takes that part of the psalm to himself, which is fundamental to, and, in a manner, comprehensive of, the whole: as it is expressive of the natural weakness of the instruments, which THE ALMIGHTY is pleas'd to use for the perfecting his own praise: and, as it tends, at the same time, to illustrate the divine goodness and power; both by the honour, which he thus puts upon our nature, and the extraordinary works he performs by it; especially, in the person of CHRIST, who is still to the natural eye, what he was to the

¹ Matth. xxi. 16.

² 1 Cor. xv. 47.

unbelieving Jews: *A root out of a dry ground*¹. But to proceed. We have not only scriptural testimony to alledge, tho' of the highest kind and coming from the lip of truth; but likewise,

3. IN the next place, remarkable facts to speak for us. Witness,

1.) FIRST of all, the positive assurance given us in this point by CHRIST himself, soon after his resurrection, where he spake to his disciples, saying: *All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth*².—This, I own, in regard to others, was a declaration only; but, in reference to CHRIST himself, was a matter of fact. He actually had this power: *all power in heaven and in earth*. And the distributions he made on this occasion, as he commission'd his disciples to go and *preach the gospel to all nations*; and the wonderful effects, in miracles and conversions, which he wrought by their hands, through the whole world, amply demonstrate the truth of the declaration.—Here the history of the apostles and first publishers of the gospel, without entering into particulars (which would be tedious) brings with it the full and proper testimony. Let it then be ask'd, Whence all these amazing events? but that CHRIST, *this great son of man*, being now openly acknowledged and rewarded, in his mediatorial function; began now to exercise more visibly and univer-

¹ Isa. liii. 2.

² Matth. xxviii. 18.

sally, that extensive dominion, which, from his first constitution, had been inseparably annex'd to his divine character. Again,

2.) ANOTHER fact, proving that the human is the alone nature here concern'd, and therefore CHRIST, as the head of that nature, is, that a *principal branch* of this dominion [such as pre-supposes his interest in all former dispensations of government, and secures to him all future applications of power, during the continuance of the mediatorial kingdom: I say, another consideration in our favour is, that a *principal branch* of this dominion] that, for example, which is now, particularly, exercised by heaven, both in the world and in the church, is *absolutely denied to the angelical species of all orders and ranks whatsoever*. They are all herein set aside, or distanc'd: what I mean, is, that they are not intrusted with the present administration of affairs, either temporal or spiritual; as, we have sufficient reason to suppose, they had been before, under the legal oeconomy; or, most probably, thro' the whole dispensation of the old testament: THE ALMIGHTY, herein, appearing, in a good measure, to *overlook* ¹ the bulk of mankind, as the apostle tells us ².

THAT the above observation is matter of fact St. Paul informs us in these words: *Unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come, whereof we speak* ³.—By the world

¹ Ὑπεριδὼν ὁ Θεός.
ii. 5.

² Acts xvii. 30.

³ Heb.

to come, in this place, the apostle intends that period of time and it's concerns, which is more strictly call'd *Christian*, otherwise term'd *The Gospel*, or *New Testament State*; which commenc'd, especially, on *the resurrection* of CHRIST, and is to run down to *the consummation of all things*¹. What then is here asserted concerning the disposals of this period? Verily, that the administration of things, for the whole of it, whether temporal or spiritual, *is not committed to the angels*. As there is a change of dispensation in the church, so is there likewise a change in the external administration of all affairs in the church; and, consequently, of all affairs in the world; meaning in matters of natural providence and civil society: because these intirely depend upon the church, or subsist only for the sake of the righteous.

Now, that the prohibition in this place, extends to all angelical natures in common, we take the liberty of concluding on your lordship's own principles: because, when you affirm of CHRIST, that he is a *super-angelical Intelligence*, it is plain (provided *The Essay* be intelligible, and consistent with itself) your lordship intends by that expression, not barely *the next order* of beings above ourselves; or such creatures as are term'd *angels*, in the strict

¹ Those, who want farther evidence for this interpretation of the words, Οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα, *the world to come*, cannot, I think, fail of meeting with it, in *Whitby's* annotations on the place.

sense of the word ; but every other rank of existence, still their superiors ; such as *thrones, dominions, principalities, &c.* through the whole scale of created being. For as much as it is certain, these are all included among the number of the inhabitants of *that heaven*, over which the power of CHRIST, as MEDIATOR, extends¹. But, as was said above, the declaration concerning all of them collectively, is, that they have no share in the present government of the world, neither in civil nor religious matters. *This universal dominion* is so far from being their right, that it is expressly denied to all of them.—This then, give me leave to say, is a strong negative on your lordship's reasoning in the argument before us.

BUT, tho' this be the whole requir'd of us by the present head, we need not, however, rest it intirely here. Because, if we only ask the question : Who then is the person distinguish'd with this universal authority ? And give ourselves the trouble of looking a little farther into the chapter, we shall find it said : *But we see JESUS—crowned with glory and honour.*—But if JESUS be the person, it is then very plain, that he stands here opposed to the whole body of angels. And, that this opposition does not consist barely in office, but in nature also, we may be farther positive of, by consulting the context ; particularly, verse 14, where it is affirmed of this JESUS : that *for as much as the children are partakers of*

¹ See § xcii.

flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same. Because here, not only the relation subsisting between the head and members, as they are *all children* of the same family [for he is not ashamed to call them *brethren*, verses, 11 & 12] loudly attests, that there is one nature common to CHRIST and his followers; but it is put beyond all manner of doubt, by it's being affirm'd, that CHRIST actually *partook of flesh and blood.* For tho' those words may be understood primarily of his body, as stooping even to that part of our frailty; yet, I am inclin'd to think, they may also be understood, as including the whole human nature. For why, as has been said above, would he take the lower, if an intire stranger to the other part of our nature? Nor so only: but the terms, I apprehend, are expressly used in this sense by *Adam*, upon God's presenting the woman to him, that he had form'd from one of his ribs. For how does he express himself? *This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh*: comprehending under those terms the whole woman in both her constituent parts, body and soul. And thus CHRIST partook of *our flesh and blood*, in proof of his being a true and proper man, as we are; and as such, being emphatically *that son of man*, who was to share *universal dominion* in opposition to all other created beings whatever. But I go on to observe,

¹ Gen. ii. 23.

3.) THAT CHRIST is now actually *sat down*, invested with this universal dominion, *at the right hand of the majesty on high*. This is a fact so well known, and so generally allow'd, that it will be sufficient for our present purpose, to exhibit a plain view of it in the language of scripture-revelation. Here then we read, not only that God has *raised him from the dead*; but also, that he *has set him at his own right-hand in the heavenly places*. And to convince us of the pre-eminence of this situation, it is added: *Far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name, that is named, not only in this world, but also in that, which is to come. And hath put all things under his feet; and gave him, to be head over all things to the church*¹.

AND in what light can we look upon this process, except it be, that it gives us a view of CHRIST's open installment into this high prerogative? Unless we consider it, both as a specimen and pledge of those future honours, which are yet in reserve for him, as a farther accomplishment of the accounts given us by *David* in the above psalm? To the consideration of which [future honours] we are now hastening; only here previously observing, as the summary of the present branch of the argument: that thus far we see in what instances, the glorious account before us has been already fulfill'd in the person of CHRIST. And therefore, what solid reason there is to

¹ Eph. i. 20—22.

conclude, that he is, in an eminent sense, *that great son of man*, refer'd to by *the Psalmist*. However, to add farther weight to the argument, we have to observe, that there is yet a double period in futurity, in which OUR SAVIOUR's right to the character of UNIVERSAL LORD, will receive increasing demonstration and lustre. For example :

(1.) DURING that part of time, which bears the denomination of CHRIST's *spiritual reign*; being a period yet to come; a kingdom to take place on the present earth, vicious and corrupt as it now is: to the duration of which a space of two hundred and ten years is allotted, according to computations made from the prophet *Ezekiel*: [chap. xxxix. 12.]

NOW the event, on which this state is supposed more precisely to commence, is, that of the conversion of the whole *Jewish* nation, after their re-settlement in the land of *Judea*; to be followed by the universal accession of the *Gentile* world to this *their rising or light*.—For the peculiar nature of it, it's supposed to consist, in the pure administration of THE WORD and SACRAMENTS over the whole earth; accompanied with a state of general peace and spirituality: every thing, that is holy in divine matters; and every thing, that is righteous in civil, so far prevailing, as to lay a proper foundation for its being term'd, in a

• Isa. lx. 3.

figurative sense: *New heavens and a new earth*.—Who then cannot see from this description, short as it is, that OUR SAVIOUR must now exercise a more visibly extensive government (in divine things, at least) than he had ever been known, or acknowledged, to have exercised before; and, consequently, that the accounts in this eighth psalm, now under consideration, will herein receive a more ample accomplishment in his person? For, certain it is, that this is the period, in which he is to regain, in an eminently public manner, *the throne of his father David*²; to reign among his *antient people the Jews gloriously*³; and in which *the kingdoms of this world are to become the kingdoms of OUR LORD and of his CHRIST*⁴; that is, the church, *his anointed*⁵. However, we stop not here having to subjoin

(2.) A GENERAL view of that period, which is called CHRIST's *personal reign*.—As to the seat of this kingdom, it is to be the future *new heavens and new earth*, in the literal sense of those words⁶; which are to arise from those now about us, after their being purged by the general conflagration.—The duration assign'd to this happy period, is that of *a thousand years*⁷.—The grand event, on which it is to take place, is, the revelation of CHRIST,

¹ Isa. lxxv. 17. ² Luke i. 32. ³ Isa. xxiv. 23. ⁴ Rev. xi. 15. ⁵ 1 Cor. xii. 12. comparing both places with *Daniel*, ch. vii. 27. ⁶ Rev. xxi. 1. ⁷ Ibid. xx. 4.

the second time, from heaven; attended with the resurrection of *the righteous only*¹, and the close confinement of satan and his angels in the abyss, or *bottomless pit*².—The general business of this state is, on the part of CHRIST, that he may be glorified in his saints, and be admir'd in all them that believe³; and, on the part of his followers, that they may enter fully into the joy of their LORD: and that as CHRIST has now received his kingdom, HIS eminently, from the hands of THE FATHER, as the reward of his obedience and passion; so that now, his followers may likewise receive, at the hands of their LORD, such different rewards as are proportionate to the various graces they possess'd; the pious services they perform'd, and the respective sufferings they underwent, while confin'd to a state of mortality.—Here then CHRIST is *all in all*⁴, more strictly or literally [as it shall be said of THE FATHER on the conclusion of this period⁵;] and therefore every thing, even death and hell, is now made visibly subject to him. This then being the completion of the whole (including our LORD's judgment of the wicked, on the close of the thousand years :) we see the present accounts carried to their height. And therefore from hence draw a conclusive proof, that as *this universal dominion* was originally promised to, and settled upon the human nature; and

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 23.
10.

⁴ Col. iii. 11.

² Rev. xx. 1.

⁵ 1 Cor. xv. 28.

³ 1 Thess. i.

has been all along, thro' the several periods of time, more or less fulfill'd in CHRIST, and shall now, at last, receive it's consummation in *the personal part* of his reign: so, that CHRIST, and no other, is emphatically *that man*, and *that son of man*, of whom David, *strictly* and *supremely*, pronounces these great things; and, consequently, that he is, at no rate, to be consider'd as a super-angelical nature. Which was the thing here to be proved. Once more,

XII. GIVE me leave, to maintain *the negative* against your lordship, on the present question: Because nothing is more certain, than that there is such a created spirit as *Michael*, standing at the head of the angelical host, as the first or principal angel; therefore call'd *the arch-angel*, emphatically: and that there is sufficient reason to conclude, that this created spirit sustains the name of arch-angel, and acts in that capacity, in distinction from CHRIST, THE MEDIATOR, and in strict subserviency to him.

* For, I am humbly of opinion, that *Michael* is barely the head of the angelical order, meaning that rank of spirits, who are next immediately above the human in the scale of being; and not, that he is at the head of the other superior orders. Because there seems to me equal reason for supposing that each of them have their chief, as well as the angels; and, consequently, that there is an *arch-principality*, an *arch-power*, and so on through the several orders, up to that created spirit, which is most exalted in his private, metaphysical nature. *Michael* therefore, I presume, is properly *the arch-angel*, that is, the chief or first angel, and no more.

THAT there is such a created super-angelical spirit, is evident to a demonstration from that testimony by St. *Jude*, verse the ninth: *Yet Michael, the arch-angel, when contending with the devil, he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said: THE LORD rebuke thee.*

IT is very true, your lordship allows this account, I mean, the existence of such a created super-angelical spirit; but are pleased to apply it to CHRIST, the MEDIATOR, instead of considering it as the character of a mere angel, absolutely distinct in nature from CHRIST. For, that this is the real fact, in the place before us, I imagine, may be proved from such considerations as these. For example,

I. FROM *the very work*, in which this angel appears to be here employ'd: namely, the burial of the body of *Moses*. For, surely, we can never suppose it necessary, that THE MEDIATOR should descend himself upon this errand: he, who is *far above all principality, and power, and might and dominion*; and therefore has right in himself to detach them on this, or the other service, as he sees proper: tho', it is probable, the angelical order, as bearing the nearest resemblance to the human nature, are the spirits, chiefly, if not altogether, retain'd

Whether it may be an objection to this thought, that we are said to *wrestle not [only] against flesh and blood, but [also] against principalities, against powers, &c.* *Eph. vi. 12*: I leave with

retain'd as ministers in our world. However that be, having so large a retinue about him, always ready to execute his commands, it is by no means rational to suppose, that THE MEDIATOR [who, or what, ever, he be] would himself engage in the present [menial] service; the burial of *Moses's* body; but, as St. *Jude* here declares, intrust it with *Michael*, the arch-angel. Add to this,

2. A CORROBORATING proof from *the dispute*, which arose on this head between the arch-angel and the devil: the one (as is probably suppos'd) insisting, that the body should not be buried, or, at least, that the place of it's interment should be known; that it might afterwards prove a snare to *the Jews*. The other insisting on the execution of his commission: namely, that it should not only be interr'd, but that the place of burial should be conceal'd; for reasons known to his lord or master. And that this was no more than a commission, or that the arch-angel acted herein by deputation, and not as a principal, will appear

with others to consider. Because, if we meet with opposition from these superior orders, there seems some colour of reason to infer, that good angels of the like exalted nature, may be commission'd by CHRIST to give us assistance.—Otherwise, as there may be innumerable worlds of intelligent creatures, in a gradual ascent, superior to the angels, as the order next immediately above us; it may be reasonable enough to suppose, that these superior spirits have their several allotments amongst those worlds, according to their different rise in the scale of being.—But this is all conjecture,

3. IN the next place, from *the manner*, in which he managed this dispute with the devil; which, it is very observable, is far from carrying in it the least air of personal authority, or superior official dignity; but merely, by *an humble application* to his principal or constituent; praying him to exert, in his favour, that extraordinary power, which was necessary to check the audacious attempts of *satan*; such a restraint from THE ALMIGHTY, or from CHRIST, himself, being absolutely proper to the punctual discharge of the orders he had receiv'd from him on this head.

THIS, therefore, abundantly proves, not only that the arch-angel is *personally distinct* from CHRIST, but *positively inferior* to him. Because, tho' it be in itself irrational to conceive, as was said above, that CHRIST would descend himself on this work; yet, supposing him actually to have come down, it is not only very improbable, on the one hand, that he would have enter'd into a verbal contest with the devil on this occasion; but, on the other, absolutely contrary to the nature of things, to imagine, that he should be in want of the necessary power to vanquish his adversary; were we only to consider him in his *mediatorial* capacity [for *that* he stood vested with *from everlasting*]; especially, when we recollect, that OUR SAVIOUR could speak *authoritatively* to the devil and command his absence, even in his state of humiliation, when

he

he was properly acting the part of a *servant*, saying : *Get thee hence, satan* ¹.

NOR is this the only place, which appears to speak of the arch-angel *Michael*, as a spirit *personally distinct* from CHRIST. For this seems to me apparently the case in that of *Daniel*, ch. x. 13 : *But the prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me one and twenty days : but lo ! Michael, the first of the chief princes came to help me.* And again, at verse 21 : *There is none that holdest [or strengtheneth himself] with me in these things, but Michael, your prince.*

Now, that *the same arch-angel* is intended here, as in that passage of *St. Jude*, is evident to me from the following method of reasoning.—The angel, who is here discoursing with *Daniel*, is *Gabriel*, as appears from accounts in the preceding chapter ; commission'd from above to give him a particular view of some remarkable occurrences relative to the *Jewish* nation, now captive at *Babylon*. Here then he speaks of *chief princes* [as tutelar angels] in general ; and, as instances of this kind, makes mention of no less than *three* in this chapter ; saying at the 20th verse : *And, when I am gone forth, lo ! the prince of Grecia shall come.* The *three* then, are evidently these : namely, *Michael*, the first of *these chief princes*, for *Israel* ; then the guardian angel of *Persia*, and, lastly, that for the monarchy of *Greece*.—For, if *chief princes* in one part of the verse

¹ Matth. iv. 10.

signify *tutelar angels*, as appears clearly to me, from *Michael's* being call'd *the chief of them*, and, in particular *the prince of Daniel's people*; what room can there be to doubt, but that the word has the same signification in the other part of the verse; I mean, where we read of *the prince of the kingdom of Persia*? And thus again afterwards, where we hear of *the prince of the kingdom of Greece*? But farther, to invert the argument:

THAT the princes of *Persia* and *Greece* absolutely sustain this character of *guardian angels*, is abundantly clear from *the offices* they are allow'd, by expositors, to perform in favour of their respective nations; the former attempting to keep *the Jews* still in *Persia*, for the advantage of that kingdom; and therefore using all his efforts in the council of *Cyrus*, to dissuade him from giving them permission to return to *Palestine*: the latter, on the contrary, attempting to bring about *this return* [which seems also to be the first and immediate object of *Gabriel's* care, in his attending the court of *Cyrus* at this time;] and, in consequence of it, to transfer the kingdom of *Persia* to the *Greeks*; thereby to bring on *the third universal monarchy*. — This then proves, that as they are here eminently concern'd for the interest of these particular kingdoms; so, that they have right to be consider'd as their *protectors*, or *guardian angels*, under THE MESSIAH. But, if this be true of *the princes of Persia* and *Greece*, why not also of *Michael*, the arch-angel?

angel? Does he not appear on the same list with them? Are not the same Things said of *Michael* in reference to the kingdom of *Israel*, that are here said of the other *guardian* angels for *Persia* and *Greece*? And, if he discharge *the same offices*, does he not justly stand intitled to *the same character*? Is it not in this express light, that *Gabriel* here speaks of him to *Daniel*, when he says, that *Michael*, one [or, the first] of these chief princes, *came to help him*? meaning, in his contest with the *tutelar angel* of *Persia*; as being sent to second *Gabriel's* attempts, at that court, in favour of *the Jews*. Nay (if the repetition may be excused) does he not expressly call him, *your prince*? By which, in a consistency with the same character, in other parts of this discourse, he can only mean *that angel*, who had been peculiarly charged with the affairs of *Israel*: and after this again, in the 12th chap. ver. 1: *That great prince, which standeth for the children of thy people.*—What clearer proof then can we want, that *Michael* is actually a *guardian angel* [here to be consider'd as such] in common with those, who did, at that time, preside over the nations of the earth; only, with this mark of distinction, that he was *the first*, or *chief* of such created spirits: and, that *the very same created spirit* is here intended by this name, as in the epistle by St. *Jude*? Because we have not the least colour of reason to suppose, that there are *two Michaels* of this exalted cha-

racter. But, if this appears to have been his direct province, and the arch-angel, in both places, be one and the same; it then follows, of course, that he must be personally distinct from CHRIST; the whole argument witnessing to this truth.

THERE is only one place more, I think, and that in *the Revelation*, where holy scripture takes notice of this arch-angel by name. The words are these: *And there was war in heaven [meaning, either the Roman empire at large, or the Christian church, in particular:] Michael and his angels fought against the dragon, and the dragon fought and his angels*¹.

I AM sensible, there are *interpreters*, and those, perhaps, by no means inconsiderable; either for learning or piety; who understand this place of CHRIST and the angelical host literally; but, I confess, I am so far from discovering any proper grounds for this application of the words, that, I imagine, there are very good reasons to the contrary: namely,

I. The *RATIO*, or *principle*, on which the the present description is assum'd.—Now, to come at this, we must know, that St. *John*, in the book of *the Revelation*, copies very much the *style* and *imagery* of the old testament; and therefore that, the general representation of things [especially in reference to *the Christian church*;) the names of the principal actors; the scene of action, and the machinery or lesser circumstances, are frequently borrow'd from

¹ Ch. xii. 7.

such persons or events, as had, at any time, made the greatest figure in, or most nearly affected, the religion and civil polity of the *Jews*. Hence then, in particular, it comes to pass, that as *the enemies* of the christian church are in this, and other parts of *the Revelation*, describ'd by the names of those persons or kingdoms, who were the principal enemies of the *Hebrew nation*: so, we shall find, that *the protection* of the church in the new testament state of it, is likewise spoken of, as committed to the charge of those, who appear to have been eminently concern'd in *the same kind of offices* for the ancient kingdom of *Israel*: whether they be THE FATHER, as THE ONE GOD¹; JESUS, as THE MEDIATOR²; or one, or more of his ministring servants, *the angels*³. [For this must be granted, that the divine providence peculiarly presid'd in favour of *this people*; there being no one instance, that I can remember to have read, where any neighbouring secular state was ever call'd-in to their assistance, by an express order, or warrant, from heaven.]—This then appears the real matter of fact, I mean, that *the representations*

¹ 1 Cor. viii. 6. John xvii. 3. ² 1 Tim. ii. 5.

³ That angels have been always more, or less, employed in the defense of the church, may not only be infer'd from accounts to this effect in *the Maccabees* [ch. iii. 25, &c. ch. xi. 8, 10.] which were, probably, founded on tradition, and seem to speak the common opinion of mankind, at that time; but appears evident to me from what *David* has deliver'd on this subject, *Psalms*. xxx. 5, 6. compar'd with these passages in *Daniel*.

in *this book*, are generally, if not altogether, drawn from *similar occurrences* under the old testament. And, that they should proceed on this model, is certainly very reasonable, on this double account: namely, first, because the *Mosaical* state was, undoubtedly, an emblem of *the Christian*; or, rather, the same church under a different form. And, secondly, because it is certain, that *the Jews* themselves, notwithstanding their present situation, are principally concerned in some of the most important and determining events in *this book*: a consideration that will, of itself, assert the propriety of their being describ'd after the manner of *their own prophets*.

WHEREFORE then, taking *this single principle* into the account, it will be no difficult matter to conceive, by what means, that same exalted spirit, who is allowed to have been the *tutelar angel* of *the Jews*; should be here introduced as appearing equally in defense of the church under the present dispensation; nor as appearing here only by himself, but as bringing *his angels* along with him into the combat. For, as we may reasonably suppose, that he had his inferior ministers, concurring with him on such occasions, where he was called to the assistance of the *Jewish* church: so, may we farther suppose, that, where he now appears, under the new testament state of things, in favour of the *Christian* church; he there likewise comes attended with those angels, who are appointed to act *under him*.

him. Nor is there any thing in the supposition injurious, either in regard to *Michael*, the arch-angel; or, to the body of angels, his co-adjutors. Since, as they are *all ministring spirits* (according to the accounts of the new testament) and ready to do service to any one member of CHRIST, individually; so, are they, doubtless, equally, if not more ready, to act in concert, where the affairs of the church, in general, may require their attendance.——We cannot suppose, that they are kept *idle*: and, as services of this kind appear to have been their province under the old testament; we cannot but conclude, as the present is a rise on that dispensation, but that they are still ambitious of being useful to us under the new testament. In which view of things, we not only see upon what principle the description before us proceeds; but with what justice the account may be explained of *Michael*, the arch-angel, in distinction from CHRIST, the MEDIATOR. Because, as the church is, in fact, the same, and different only in dispensation, it is natural to suppose, that the same angels, who had been more immediately it's *guardians* under the preceding state of things, are still retain'd by CHRIST in the service of the new-testament church; as persons versed in matters of this kind, and by their former concerns with it, sharing a sort of natural affection for the church: but acting now, not so immediately *in their own right*, I mean, as *direct tutelar angels*; as *by commissions*, occasionally given out

G

by

by CHRIST; as *he* may, from time to time, observe his followers in want of this superior assistance. But this is not all: for the same truth, I imagine, will farther discover itself, if we consider,

2. THE REAL design of the place; and that, as well in regard to *the event* here immediately in view, as in regard to *the persons*, who may be supposed *the immediate actors* in it. As to the former of these; namely,

1.) THE EVENT, here immediately refer'd to: it is manifestly no other, than the subversion of the old *Roman* empire, as *Pagan* (properly describ'd under the character of *the dragon* and *his angels*;) and the establishment of the *Christian* religion in the same empire, by such instruments, as we shall likewise find fitly describ'd by the other characters in the text. For it being allow'd (as the best expositors do) that *this* is the great revolution in view; who cannot see, that the work itself admirably agrees with the precise business of *Michael*, and these other *chief princes*, the *tutelar* angels, as above represented? namely, that of *transferring* the *Roman* power from one form to another. For example: changing *Paganism* for *Christianity*: therefore, pulling down the one, and, consequently, those secular powers, in *the eastern part* of the empire, who abetted *the Pagan superstition*; and setting-up the other, and, therefore, assisting those *Christian* princes and magistrates, in *the western part* of it, who rose in it's defense.—Here, therefore, as
was

was observ'd above, *the work itself* evidently speaks in favour of *Michael* and *his associates*, in the literal sense of the words. But this brings me

2.) To the next observable in the passage, as a farther evidence of the truth in dispute; namely, the persons immediately concern'd, *as actors*, in this great work; in which case, the choice is absolutely divided between these two: that is to say, either those, who were *the invisible*, or others, *the visible actors* on this occasion: unless, it be thought proper to include *both*.

(1.) If there are then persons, who choose to impute this revolution to the efficacy of *invisible instruments*, or to allow *such* a share in it; who can there be suppos'd more suitable to the nature of the work itself, than *Michael* and *his angels*? Not only as their general character exactly answers to the present business, or, as they would naturally fall into it, both from *experience* and *affection* to the church; but, as it also agrees with particular services of this kind positively ascribed to them, under the old testament.—Nor can I think it an improbable conjecture, that there may be here a transient allusion to what the prophet says of *Michael*, when he speaks of him *as standing up* for the *Jewish* church; since the work, for kind, is evidently the same in both places.

As to those, who take the liberty of referring this matter to CHRIST himself (for there are some, who do not scruple to subject him to a *personal attendance* on this occasion) that

interposition, I apprehend, cannot but appear plainly unnecessary ; from what has been already suggested on this subject. And where it is not absolutely necessary, I think, we should be careful not to introduce HIM, as immediately operative, much less THE FATHER. It is, surely, sufficient, in the present service, that they act by their ministers, and these, most certainly, are *the angels* ; but, if *they* are concern'd, then, no doubt, *Michael*, as their head or leader. No matter, to what bad purposes, others have wrested this doctrine ; let not us be afraid of acknowledging the truth, because there are men of *corrupt minds*, who have abused it, to a *superstitious worshiping* of angels.

EVERY event, indeed, in the highest sense of the word, must be refer'd to THE MEDIATOR, or to GOD in CHRIST. But, when this reference is made, it by no means intends *his personal descent*, or *immediate appearance* on every occasion, and in every place [for, as to his essential presence, ALMIGHTY GOD, and therefore CHRIST in HIM, *fills all in all* ;] but his acting *by deputation*, or the interposition of *second causes*, as he may see proper : which, again, brings the account down to his ministers, as before. Here then we see *the invisible actors*. But besides these, supposing them admitted, we must likewise

(2.) FARTHER take notice of such, as were *the visible actors* in this wonderful revolution. And here the persons who present, are *Con-*
stantine

Constantine and *his successors*; including all the powers under them, whether civil or military: all the sovereign princes and magistrates, who concur'd with him, and who succeeded him, in this great and good design: namely, the destroying *the old, red dragon*, the pagan superstition; and introducing and establishing the doctrine and worship of the christian church.

HERE then, we see, are instruments far enough remov'd from CHRIST, THE MEDIATOR: what I mean is, such as will lead us into a true interpretation of the place, without making it necessary for us to suppose, that CHRIST himself interfer'd *personally* in this work. And yet, there is again, here also, this common reason for introducing OUR LORD, or applying the event to him, in it's highest sense; that these christian emperors and magistrates, acted as much under the power, and by the authority of CHRIST, as can be supposed of *the invisible agents*, before mentioned.

HOWEVER, all this while, taking the account in which sense we will, we see no necessity of referring the work to CHRIST *personally*; and, therefore, have proper reason to acquiesce in the present interpretation: which, as to *the visible actors*, leads us to *Constantine* and *his successors*; and, in respect of *the invisible*, to *Michael* and *his angels*, in the literal sense of those words: but, if to him, then, of course, to a created spirit, *personally distinct* from OUR blessed SAYIOUR.

AND, permit me to ask your lordship, What is there in all these offices, that does not strictly agree with the character, or come within the powers of a created angel? even taking things on your lordship's own principles. It is sufficient, by your own reasoning, that he be an angel, and no more than an angel, cloth'd with *proper authority* and *power* from THE ALMIGHTY. Here then, is such an angel: one, nevertheless, who appears in these several instances, as different from CHRIST, as *the master* of the house is distinct from *the servant*; or, rather, as THE CREATOR of angels is different from, and superior to, the angels created.

IT is true, we cannot from hence prove, that THE MEDIATOR is properly *a man*, or a spirit of our own order; we may, however, from hence justly infer, that CHRIST and the arch-angel are *personally distinct*: and therefore, we must also, at the same time, needs see the last reason to dissuade us from embracing your lordship's hypothesis. Because it leads us to confound OUR SAVIOUR with the arch-angel; or would persuade us, that THESE TWO are one and the same intelligence.—For, as we hinted before, it will hardly be imagin'd, I presume, that there are two arch-angels, both of them call'd *Michael*; and that this arch-angel, who, we are sure, is no more than a created angel, is superior to him, who is THE MEDIATOR. Be his *metaphysical* nature what it will; CHRIST must surely have *the pre-eminence*, if the highest

est order of angels are his workmanship ; and if, as the apostle says, he has *by inheritance* [a claim, founded *in nature*] obtain'd a *more excellent name*, than they ¹.

NOT but, if the present reasoning should be though deficient in proof of *this* personal distinction ; we have yet to call to our assistance that passage in *the Thessalonians*, which, at least, in conjunction with what has been here offer'd, cannot but give it full evidence with those, who read for conviction. The words are these: *For THE LORD himself* [terms, I suppose, all will allow, peculiarly referable to CHRIST, as here represented coming to judgment: *For THE LORD himself*] *shall descend from heaven with a shout* [meaning, possibly, the joyful acclamations of all his attendants, saints and angels] *with the voice of the archangel, &c.* one, therefore, *emphatically* so called, and here apparently distinguish'd from THE LORD HIMSELF, whose descent he attends, and whose coming he proclaims (agreeable to parallel accounts) *with the sound of a trumpet* ². — Thus are the sacred oracles fruitful of proof, *God himself give us hearts to understand* ³.

BUT, there will, probably, be farther occasion of speaking to these things, when I come to look into the contents of *particular scriptures* relative to this subject.

¹ Heb. i. 4. ² 1 Ep. iv. 16. ³ 1 Cor. xv. 52.
Matth. xxiv. 31. ⁴ Deut. xxix. 4.

HAVING thus gone through such reasons, as we had to offer on *the negative* of the question before us, peculiar to our first head of arguments; meaning such, more strictly, as give us a view of CHRIST's private, metaphysical nature, from the consideration of his general character, as THE SAVIOUR of us, creatures of the human species: my next business, according to the method at first laid down, will be with such other reasons, as seem, rather, to fall under a secondary examination. Because they are supposed, not to speak so directly to the structure of OUR SAVIOUR's person, abstractly consider'd; as to his constitution and charge, more especially, in quality of THE ONE MEDIATOR: leading us, therefore, from the nature of his work, or the various offices he performs, to form a true judgment of his metaphysical substance, or personal frame. These, likewise, may come under a two-fold division, as some of them may be more general, and others of them more particular. Wherefore to begin with those of the former class. We may then observe,

I. IN the first place, that all his concerns as MEDIATOR and REDEEMER [so far as the former word implies different parties, such as GOD and *man*, in a *state of variance*; and the latter leads us to consider *our own nature* under a circumstance of *thralldom* or *misery*: all his concerns, both as MEDIATOR and REDEEMER,] precisely settle upon us, creatures of the human

human species, and us only. A sufficient proof, surely, that he is a branch of the same nature, and not a being super-angelical.

THAT the present, is a just representation, on the part of CHRIST and *ourselves*, may be reasonably infer'd from the first promise: *The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head*¹. Because the deliverance by this means provided, could only affect the nature, which *Satan* had enslav'd. The promise was a provision for the injury, we, the human species, had sustain'd in *the fall*; and therefore the contents of it were peculiar to ourselves, the nature seduced.—Again: the present account is supported by all the promises made of THE MESSIAH to the patriarchs, *Abraham*, particularly; and to the whole church, during the old testament period. For, as it was in one, who was to be a descendant from *Abraham's* loins, according to *the flesh*, that *all the nations* of the earth *were to be blessed*²; so OUR SAVIOUR is expressly stiled *the desire of all nations*³.—This, likewise, is farther evident from accounts given us by CHRIST himself, under the character of *Wisdom* in the book of *Proverbs*, where he tells us, in the fore-views of his incarnation: that *he rejoiced in the habitable parts of God's earth, and that his delights were with the sons of men*⁴. Sining angels, we observe, throughout, are no way concern'd in these transactions; neither are the inhabitants of the

¹ Gen. iii. 15.
7.

² Ibid. xviii. 18.

³ Hagg. ii.

⁴ Ch. viii. 31.

upper world (as having no wants of this kind) ever brought into the account ; but it terminates wholly with ourselves, the human, intelligent creature. As a farther proof of which, it is easy to observe, that his general concerns by *practice*, as well as *character*, always appear to have been, first, with the body of the *Jews*, as being sent immediately to *the lost sheep of the house of Israel*¹; and then, with *the Gentile world*: that he might be God's *salvation to the end of the earth*². It was therefore for our sake ; for us of the human nature, that he was *set up from everlasting*³; and that, *in the fulness of time*, he came into the world⁴. It was for us, that he submitted to be *made under the law*. For us, that he was pleased *to obey and suffer*. And therefore the text says : that *he was delivered for OUR offences, and was raised again for OUR justification*.— Again, let it be ask'd : For whose sake is he now given *to be head over all*? The answer is : for *his church*, as a collection of the human species. What are the creatures, to whose comfort and happiness he will appear, in *the future judgment*? The return is : they, among the various generations of mankind, who have embraced him, as THE true MESSIAH.— And once more : in what collective body of intelligent beings, will he be hereafter *glorified and admir'd*⁵? The answer is the same : in those of our own species, who, while living

¹ Matth. xv. 24.
viii. 23.

² Isa. xlix. 6.
⁴ Gal. iv. 4.

³ Prov.
⁵ 2 Thess. i. 10.

in this world, had acknowledg'd him, as their LORD and MASTER.

BUT why do we labour particulars? That one passage of holy scripture puts it immediately beyond all doubt: *For verily, he taketh not hold of angels* [has no manner of concern with them, but lets them sink under their first transgression;] *but of the seed of Abraham* [to recover them from the ruins of *the fall*] *he taketh hold*¹. And this *the devils* themselves are so thoroughly apprised of, that, on his approaching a number of them, with a view to dispossess them, in the days of his flesh; they cry out to him: *What have we to do with thee, JESUS, THOU SON OF GOD? art thou come hither to torment us before the time*²? There is then good will towards *fallen man*; but torment only for *sinning angels*. And why *this difference*? Why are THE SAVIOUR's regards wholly confin'd to the human nature? but that he himself has a *personal interest* in that nature: but that he himself is a branch, and the top branch of it. Say, what other could be the inducement to, what other the indearment in, this service? but that he should have the pleasure of doing honour to THE ALMIGHTY, at the same time, that he recover'd creatures, who shared the like constituent parts with himself. Nothing is a greater tie, than *similitude of soul*; *sameness of nature*: and that this is the case between THE REDEEMER and *the sons of men*, his peculiar regard to them; his precise concern for them,

¹ Heb. ii. 16.

² Matth. viii. 29.

to me, evidently prove. But this will yet appear more fully, when I have subjoin'd,

II. As, rather, *a more determinate* account of these his general concerns with mankind, the character, under which THE ALMIGHTY speaks of him by the prophet *Isaiah*, when he says: *I will give thee for A COVENANT of the people*¹; compar'd with another passage in the *Hebrews*, which I look upon to be parallel to this, and, in some measure, explanatory of it; where we are told, that JESUS was made *the surety of a better COVENANT*². His being *made surety* here, I apprehend, has much, if not altogether, the same meaning, as his being *given for a covenant* of the people, in the other text; both intimating that he undertook for a certain system of creatures, and those, under disadvantageous circumstances. And again, as a consequence of these his engagements, that there is certain work to be done; certain conditions to be perform'd for those creatures.—This then being a true state of the case, in general; we shall find, I imagine, whether we take a view of the persons themselves, for whom OUR blessed SAVIOUR engages; or, of the matters, he obliges himself to do for them; that OUR LORD is certainly an human, and not a super-angelical intelligence. Inquire we then,

¹ Ch. xlii, 6.

² *Διαθήκης*, ch. vii. 22.

I. IN the first place, who are *the persons themselves*? But these by the common suffrage of christians, as well as the universal testimony of scripture, are creatures of our own species. *Isaiah*, indeed, describes them by the name of *the people*; restraining the expression, as it should seem, more immediately to the *Jewish* nation. And *St. Paul* says: that *such an high priest*, and consequently, *such a surety*, became us¹; at the same time addressing his epistle, more strictly, to the converts of that nation: but neither the one, nor the other, is to be understood, as excluding the *Gentile* christians. And therefore *Isaiah* adds, in close connection with the above character, that CHRIST is likewise given to be *a light to lighten the Gentiles*. And, in another part of his prophecy, he lets us know, that he is God's salvation *to the end of the earth*². With which, as was said above, the whole tenor of sacred revelation agrees. So that we cannot be wrong in affirming, that the persons, who are to enjoy the benefit of the present covenant-transaction, are real converts of *all kindreds, and nations and tongues*, over the whole earth, universally³. But this being a settled point, may we not from hence take occasion to ask: Is it then certain, that CHRIST is thus engaged for the human nature; and yet, is he no part of that nature himself? [For, take away the human soul, and the nature is destroyed.] Is it, in the least,

¹ Ibid. ver. 26.
v. 9.

² Ch. xlix. 6. ³ Rev.

probable,

probable, that the party contracting should be a super-angelical being ; at the same time, that the party contracted for is merely human ? Does not a supposition of this kind carry in it something quite contradictory to the general law and order of things ? Do we not reasonably expect, on the contrary, that here, the strictest agreement of nature ; the highest personal relation, ought to subsist ? This then is the former part of the present argument, which we shall find farther strengthen'd, if we extend our views

2. To the other branch of it, and therefore take into the account *the precise obligations*, that this surety came under ; *the special terms* he subjected himself to in favour of the human nature, both as to obedience and suffering. For, as it is not easy to conceive, how a super-angelical nature should come under that law, which bound us of the human system [whereas CHRIST is said *to be made under the law*¹, meaning, the law peculiar to our nature ;] so, neither is it easy to conceive, how he should either so punctually discharge the preceptive part of it, as that *the righteousness* of the law may justly be said to be *fulfill'd in us*² ; or that he should in such manner undergo the penalty of it, as to become *the propitiation for our sins*³. Surely, these things require a similitude of nature ; a proportion between the parties. And from hence, undoubtedly, in part, we are to

¹ Gal. iv. 4.
ii. 2.

² Rom. viii. 4.

³ 1 John

trace the efficacy of his sacrifice, above those offer'd under the legal oeconomy.

BE it then ask'd, first of all, Who were the debtors, or what the party insolvent? The answer is: we, the reasonable, human creature. And let the next question, as naturally following upon the other, be this: Who was the person, that undertook to discharge this debt? Or, in the language of *the parable*, to pay the *ten thousand talents*, we owed THE ALMIGHTY, our common LORD¹? The answer is: CHRIST, *our surety*. But wherefore this commutation, unless the nature between CHRIST and us be one and the same? Who will not confess, that the nature, which sin'd, was human? Why not then the nature, that suffer'd? and that, by suffering, *purged away those sins*²? Who is there doubts, but that we, the human species, have violated the laws of our creation, and thereby shamefully dishonour'd THE LORD, our maker? Is it not then very fitting, on the principles of common reason, that one of the same nature; one, in particular, at the head of it, made under that law; *should fulfil all righteousness*³: and, by that means, both *magnify the law*⁴, and vindicate the divine perfections? This we are absolutely certain of, that as *by man came death*, so *by man came also the resurrection of the dead*⁵. And, if we are once certain of these two points, I imagine, we have the highest reason to be

¹ Matth. xviii. 24.

² Heb. i. 3.

³ Math. iii.

15.

⁴ Isa. xlii. 21.

⁵ 1 Cor. xv. 21.

perfectly

perfectly satisfied in all the rest: these being either the two points, from whence all the rest spring, or the two centres, where all the rest meet.

NOT but it were easy to pursue the subject by observing, that the first way of access to GOD, which was that of an innocent, pure nature, was shut up through the disobedience of man: [*sin always separating between God and his creatures*¹.] What then so consonant to the dictates of natural reason, as to suppose, that *a new and living way* should be open'd for us *thro' the veil*, that is to say, *the flesh of CHRIST*²? Our original communion with GOD; our earthly paradise or natural inheritance, was confessedly lost, and mortgaged by *man*: what then *so fitting*, in the reason and nature of things, as that another, *the second man*, should recover to us the smiles of the DIVINE face; redeem the incumber'd possession, and open an effectual avenue to the heavenly paradise? Wherefore, to sum up the argument, we see then from hence the character of OUR LORD; the persons for whom he undertook, and the conditions, he submitted to for their sakes.

AS to HIMSELF, he is a surety or covenant-head; for the persons, they are plainly creatures of the human nature; and for their circumstances, they are here only remarkable for their being broken or fallen. Who then, can we reasonably suppose, could have right to this

¹ Isa. lix. 2.

² Heb. x. 20.

work;

work; but one, who was our GOEL, or *near kinsman*? And how could he share either the personal, or legal qualifications, necessary to it; unless, in the first place, he stood possess'd of the same, common nature; and, as a consequence of it, in the next, took our obligations upon himself? Fact, however, it is, both that he sustains the character, and has perform'd the work: the result of which joint testimony must, I apprehend, be that, here contended for throughout; namely, that he is truly an human, and not a super-angelical spirit.

COME we now to those arguments, under the present division, which appear to be more restrained or particular. And these are such as arise from those three distinguishing characters, by which he more directly executes his general business, as THE ONE MEDIATOR between GOD and men; I mean, those of PRIEST, PROPHET and KING. Wherefore to begin with

I. THE FIRST of these: namely, *his* PRIESTLY office.—That our blessed SAVIOUR sustains this particular character, is so expressly and so frequently affirm'd in holy scripture, that it would be both a loss of time, and an affront on the christian [were he only nominally such] to labour the proof of it by transcribing of texts in a long series. Take we then one or two passages, as the whole necessary in this place. *Wherefore, holy brethren*

H

(sais

(sais St. Paul) *partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the apostle and HIGH PRIEST of our profession, CHRIST JESUS*¹. Again, he testifies saying: *CHRIST glorified not himself, to be made AN HIGH PRIEST, but he that said unto him: Thou art MY SON, to day have I begotten thee. As he saith also in another place: Thou art A PRIEST for ever, after the order of Melchisedec*². Having thus assurance of the fact itself, I mean, that CHRIST is AN HIGH PRIEST; let us next consider, what is the general business annex'd to that character. And this consists of two grand branches: namely, *oblation and intercession* [to say nothing of his right to dispense *benedictions*.] The one of these CHRIST has already discharged, the other he is now discharging. For, as it was necessary (seeing he sustain'd this character in the church) that he should have *somewhat to offer*³; so, *a body was prepar'd* him for that purpose⁴. Which body he has accordingly offer'd, as *a sacrifice* upon the cross, without the gates of *Jerusalem*⁵. Wherefore, this part of his work, as our HIGH PRIEST, being perform'd; after having been bodily present with his disciples, for the space of forty days, consequent on his resurrection, OUR LORD takes his leave of them and ascends to heaven. Here then *entering once, for all, into the [celestial] holy place*⁶ (of which *the holy of holies*

¹ Heb. iii. 1.² Ibid. ch. v. 5, 6.³ Ibid.

ch. viii. 3.

⁴ Ibid. ch. x. 5.⁵ Ibid. ch. xiii.

12.

⁶ Ibid. ch. ix. 12.

was only a faint shadow under the law) *by his own blood*, we are told, *he ever lives to make intercession*¹; as the other branch of *his PRIESTLY office*. What then remains farther; but that we consider, who the persons are, for whom he thus intercedes; what the consideration is, that retains him in their favour, and wherein his personal qualification for it primarily consists.

As to the first of these particulars, *the persons* for whom he intercedes; it will, I presume, be allowed, that they are the human, intelligent creature. However the text is very express: *Every high priest taken from among men, is ordained for men*²: and, in particular, that *CHRIST is a merciful and faithful HIGH PRIEST, in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people*³: meaning, undoubtedly, us of the human nature, *the people transgressing*. But why for us? What could be *his motive* to it? What *his suitability* for it? [For those are the other articles hinted at above:] Is it answer'd? that both these particulars turn on his having the same bodily compages, or external frame with ourselves? A poor inducement, certainly! A slender qualification, indeed! —For though it be granted, that he had a body of the same materials with our own; yet, surely, that could neither recommend him as a fit intercessor with God, nor a fit sacrifice for man. Be-

¹ Ibid. ch. vii. 25.
ch. ii. 17.

² Ibid. ch. v. 1.

³ Ib.

cause, be his body organized as it will, it would be still a bare system of matter; and therefore be a poor foundation, either for his submitting to this charge, or for his being successful in it.

WHEREFORE, to account for the effects holy scripture every where attributes to OUR LORD's sacrifice and advocacy, as the former is term'd *the expiation of our sins*, or the channel, thro' which *we receive the atonement*; and as the latter is attended with *the [sensible] forgiveness of our sins*, and the continued supply of our various necessities: I repeat it, to account for these glorious effects, as resulting from the present character, we must be obliged, I imagine, to go somewhat farther; to look out for something nearer, than what a similitude of body only, can furnish us with. Whither then, or to what? will be the question; particularly, in regard to his sacrifice; that we may speak to that, first. I own, I see no resource left us, unless we may take into the account, his reasonable spirit or soul, as human; an intelligence of our own order. Here, certainly, lies the proportion: here the true, distinguishing relation. For to suppose this body inform'd, or animated by a superangelical spirit, would be to raise the sacrifice as much above our nature, as to suppose the person suffering a mere man, would be to sink it below CHRIST. There would, at least, be a considerable disproportion in the case: so that it could not but appear *distorted* in both

it's

it's parts. And therefore the true medium, I suppose, must be the human nature (under certain, necessary qualifications) and that only. Here there is evidently an essential connexion: and, indeed, such an one alone, as can any way bespeak CHRIST a fit HIGH PRIEST in point of nature, and a prevalent one in point of suffering: thus accounting precisely for his being *a propitiatory sacrifice*, as it is man suffering FOR men, that is, in their room or stead; [as the sacrifices under the law did FOR the offender himself:] the top branch of the human nature suffering FOR us, the lower branches of it.

AND, as this appears to me the only probable method of reasoning in respect of our SAVIOUR'S oblation; so, likewise, in respect of his intercession.—One quality fundamental to the true discharge of this part of his PRIESTLY office, is, that he be *merciful* [which *mercy* leads to *faithfulness*, the other grand quality in this character¹:] that he know how *to have compassion on the ignorant, and on them, that are out of the way*². But what is the principle immediately necessary to such a disposition? What was it in the legal priesthood? No other, than that he should be of the same nature with the persons, for whom he acted. For which reason he is said *to be taken from among men*³. And said *to be himself also compass'd with infirmity*⁴. But, if this was ne-

¹ Heb. ii. 17.
ver. 1.

² Ibid. ch. v. 2.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ver. 2.

cessary in the lower concerns of our nature, and in those high priests, who were merely figurative ; much more, surely, in that priesthood, which is the substance of *The Levitical*. And, that it must be so is evident, because OUR HIGH PRIEST has to do with the same persons ; creatures of the same nature. And we are certain, by the effects, that he manages with equal punctuality and success. But wherefore ? Verily, not that he is a super-angelical spirit ; because, it is readily seen, that such a nature would throw him at too great a distance from us, and therefore render him incapable of entering effectually into our circumstances ; but because, on the contrary, he is himself likewise *taken from among men*, a branch of our own species. In proof of which, he is said *to be made like unto his brethren* ; that account being supported by the following declaration ; that *he has been tempted in all points like as we are, only without sin* ; and again, by it's being said : that *he has actually suffer'd by these temptations* ¹.

NOT to allow this reasoning, would be to assert, that the *Aaronical* priesthood had a superiority to that sustain'd by OUR LORD ; and, consequently, that the *Jewish* church were more happy in their oeconomy than the christian ; which is not less absurd, than it would be to say, that the shadow is preferable to the substance, and that the servant is greater than

¹ Heb. ch. ii. 18. and iv. 15.

the master. Wherefore, to bring the present argument to a point: since we have full assurance, that JESUS actually sustains the office of AN HIGH PRIEST to the human nature: since we have ample proof, that he is greatly successful in the discharge of this complicated work: and, lastly, since we can be assur'd, from the nature of things, that he could never have enter'd into this consummate knowledge of our various feelings without having himself worn our nature, with all it's sinless infirmities; we may be bold to conclude from the premises, that he is not, that he cannot be, a super-angelical, but, on the contrary, an intelligence truly, and properly human. But thus much for OUR SAVIOUR'S character as AN HIGH PRIEST. We proceed now

II. To that, which speaks of him as a PROPHET.—That OUR LORD sustains this character likewise, a little acquaintance with the new testament will inform us; he being there spoken of as A PROPHET, *mighty in deed, and word before GOD, and all the people*¹. And mention'd by way of *emphasis*, as THAT PROPHET [meaning, THE MESSIAH] *that was to come into the world*². Moreover, he is described as *a teacher come from GOD*³: and is called THE APOSTLE, as well as THE HIGH PRIEST of our profession⁴. — JESUS then, descends from THE FATHER with instructions

¹ Luke xxiv. 19.
2.

² John vi. 14.

³ Ibid. ch. iii.

⁴ Heb. iii. 1.

for us, the human species, both in matters of faith and practice. But the great question is: What proof have we from hence, that he is himself *a man*? an intelligence of our order, and not super-angelical? I answer,

I. FIRST of all, *the express testimony* of that oracle, which speaks from heaven. Here I have immediately in view those words by *Moses*, of which some notice was taken above: THE LORD thy GOD will raise up unto thee A PROPHET from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me¹. The accuracy and precision, with which *Moses* here delivers himself, are very observable: just as if he had foreseen the present attack on OUR SAVIOUR's real humanity; or, rather, would, if possible, have prevented it, by laying down this truth in so strong and clear a manner, as to have left no room, in the least to scruple it. For he says: first of all, THE LORD shall raise up A PROPHET from the midst of thee; meaning, by the term *thee*, more directly, *the Jews* themselves in distinction from the heathen nations: which, in it's first, obvious construction, can be suppos'd to suggest nothing less, than that he is actually a branch of humanity. But, least that should not be sufficiently explicit, as to the metaphysical nature of THIS great PROPHET; he adds, secondly, *of thy brethren*. This, undoubtedly, may be taken in a double sense. Because THE MESSIAH, according to the flesh, was, in the first place, *of their bre-*

¹ Deut. xviii. 15.

thren,

thren,
their
lineag
especi
flesh,
ture,
the
which
right
all:
truth
shoul
me, fa
espec
name
or a
testa
that
as h
mira
of h
like
give
yet,
in t
joy
subj
neit
fam
also
TH
offi

thren, as he was a descendant from *Abraham*, their father, and expressly of *the house and lineage of David*¹. And then, secondly, and especially, because he was actually *flesh of their flesh*, and *bone of their bone*; a brother by nature, as sharing the same constituent parts of the man, body and soul, with themselves; which must be allowed to give him a just right to call them *brethren*².—Nor is this all: for yet farther to establish this interesting truth, he tells us, in the third place, that he should be a prophet *like himself*. *Like unto me*, says *Moses*. And this OUR SAVIOUR, more especially was, in the three following respects: namely, first, as he came to deliver *a body of laws*, or *a system of divine truth*, for the use of the new testament church, as *Moses* had done before to that of the old testament. Again, secondly, as he was charged with *the power of working miracles* in a great variety for the confirmation of his divine mission. A peculiar in which he likewise eminently resembled the *Jewish* law-giver. And then, thirdly and lastly, he was yet, in a more singular manner, *like Moses*, in that, according to the flesh, he positively injoy'd *the same common nature*, or *metaphysical substance* with *Moses* himself; being therefore neither angel, nor arch-angel; but one of the same family or stock. Upon which account also, it is said of him in another place, that THE ALMIGHTY *had exalted one* [to this high office, as well as the preceding] *chosen out of*

¹ Luke ii. 4.² Heb. ii. 11.

the people. Which, I apprehend, can have no determinate meaning, or none, however, that we can conceive of, unless, besides insinuating that OUR SAVIOUR, on his incarnation, took his birth from a family then quite mean, and obscure; it be likewise design'd to inform us, that he is actually a branch of the human nature; and, for that reason, among others, properly qualified in his nature for the present important charge. For, were not this the true state of the case, it would follow; that instead of it's being said, as *the Psalmist* here does: that he was chosen *out of the people*, or *mankind*, in general; or, according to the above account from *Moses*, that he was raised up from *the midst of the Jews*, in particular; both the one, and the other, ought to have said, that *he was chosen out of the angels*, or *raised up from amidst the thrones, dominions, principalities*, or the like. This then is the first argument in proof of OUR SAVIOUR's humanity, as it rises to us from his PROPHETICAL character; and is, I imagine, an argument of such weight, as to carry the last demonstration along with it: tho' the following may be also subjoin'd as auxiliary or collateral. For we have to ask on this question,

2. Is it not for this reason, that *the prophets* under the law, as well as the priests and kings of that dispensation, are called CHRIST's *fellows*?—GOD, even *thy* GOD, *hath anointed THEE with the oil of gladness above THY FELLOWS*¹:

¹ Heb. i. 9.

none of them having ever obtain'd *the unction*, perform'd *the work*, or receiv'd *the honour*, that CHRIST challenges. But why this near association? Why the present community of title? I own, I cannot but think, that it proceeds especially on this grand distinguishing principle: that CHRIST and those, who are *his fellows*, in the best and highest sense of the word, are of the same common nature.

TRUE, indeed, it is, that community in service, and that alone, sometimes lays the foundation for community in character; as where the angel says to St. *John*, when he threw himself at his feet to worship him: *See thou do it not: I am thy fellow-servant*¹. But if so, the cause is still more clear and rational, when their is added to it a similitude of nature. For thus too is OUR LORD stiled *the man God's fellow*². Because the human nature, in his person, is some how, or other, advanc'd to a participation in the divine nature. This is true of christians in general³; surely then, much more so of JESUS, their head. Wherefore, similitude of nature must be allowed the first reason in the present argument; and is, I apprehend, throughout, the grand foundation for that community of appellation or character, which subsists between CHRIST and THE CHURCH, and between GOD and CHRIST. Once more,

¹ Rev. xxii. 9.

² Zech. xiii. 7.

³ 2 Pet. i. 4.

3. Is not this, I mean, the true and proper humanity of CHRIST, the best principle for leading us into the most natural, and, at the same time, the most perfect view of *the manner*, in which OUR LORD receiv'd his instructions from THE FATHER, to qualify him for this, his PROPHETICAL office? For, since it must be confess'd, whether we suppose him man or angel; that he is to be consider'd, in both those lights, as an inferior nature: so, it cannot but follow, as a necessary conclusion, that his knowledge as such, must be universally derived. That it was absolutely such, OUR LORD never scruples acknowledging; and therefore tells us, that *his doctrine* was not *his own*, but *his*, that *sent him* ¹. And, that he still deliver'd to his disciples, what he had before receiv'd from THE FATHER ². And, that it could be no otherwise (considering him here in the PROPHETICAL character) is evident, for this very good reason: namely, that as he came not, to do; so, neither to reveal, his own will, abstractly consider'd; but the will of him, that sent him.

BUT the question is: how came he by this knowledge? [speaking of him now, as a lower nature, or as a minister only.] The text tells us, that THE SPIRIT of GOD *rested upon him* for this purpose, as THE SPIRIT of *wisdom and understanding* ³. And again: that

¹ John vii. 16.
xi. 2.

² Ibid. ch. xv. 15.

³ Isa.

GOD gave not THE SPIRIT by *measure* unto him¹. Now, as a consequence of this unction, principally, tho' not altogether, he is said to have *increased in wisdom*, as he grew in *stature*². And likewise, to have given early proofs, that *the grace* of GOD was eminently upon him³. Wherefore put all these things together, and let them be compar'd with what has been suggested above, concerning the true frame of his mind; the nature of his education, and the advancement he made in knowledge, principally, as a consequence of his having the advantage of divine illuminations in a superior degree: let these matters, I say, be first carefully collated; and then, let it be farther ask'd: whether is it more natural and rational to suppose, that these were communications or instructions from ALMIGHTY GOD to a super-angelical nature, or to one truly, and properly human?

THE ALMIGHTY, we can be sure, does every thing with propriety; every thing analogous to the nature he has to work upon, and the effects, he has to produce. What is there then here, to be farther consider'd? Certainly, that the above are measures quite level to the human mind; perfectly proportion'd to our own precise nature. Evident from hence: that they are known to be the exact methods, which he now takes for the instruction of christians in common; those, who are really

¹ John iii. 34.
ver. 40.

² Luke ii. 52.

³ Ibid.

such;

such ; and therefore the peculiars of the human nature. May we not then reasonably suppose, that he is *ever consistent* with himself ? And therefore that, observing the same methods both with CHRIST, as the head, and true christians, as members ; they must, of necessity, be all of one and the same, common nature ?

THE same reasoning will hold good, if we were to argue on the principles of common education, or from the natural efforts of the human mind. Because we should still find THE ALMIGHTY operating in the same way (therefore preserving *this analogy*) both on the mind of CHRIST, and the minds of men in general. The consequence of which would be, that all knowledge (respecting the human intelligent creature) being still deriv'd on the same principles, or by the use of the same means ; it will prove, that the structure of the mind is the same in all : and therefore, that CHRIST is as truly a branch of the human nature, as we are ourselves. Were it not thus (to return to divine knowledge, more particularly) there must be evidently an incongruity, or unfitness, in the application of the same means indifferently to CHRIST, and us of the human species, his followers. And as these means could not be equally suitable to a superangelical head, and members purely human ; so, neither could the same effects be produced by them in natures so widely different. We find, however, the reverse of all this ; that every

every thing goes on with equal regularity and success on both sides; now with *the members*, as before with *the head*: whether we examine the case, with respect to natural or divine instruction. But if so (as was said above) no tolerable account, I imagine, can be given, why THE ALMIGHTY should treat CHRIST and his followers on the same common principles; or, why there should be found this conformity both in *the methods* of instruction, and in *the effects* attending it between OUR SAVIOUR and us; unless it be, that we are absolutely of one and the same nature.—And what if we should say, that THE ALMIGHTY took this method with *the head*, because he knew, it would be *the properest*, he could take with *the members*? But that leads me to ask,

4. IN the next place, whether is not a constitution of the kind here suppos'd, that is, an human intelligence, most agreeable to *the end* of the PROPHETICAL office; meaning, the work to be done by it, or the nature to be instructed? For, as we may justly demand, what was the necessity of a super-angelical teacher, on the part of THE ALMIGHTY; since he could with the same ease qualify one of our own kind, as he could one of a superior: so, we may likewise with equal propriety inquire, what is the peculiar advantage, that is to arise to us, the human species, by his speaking to us in a nature so very disproportionate to our own, rather than in one exactly similar? An angel, it is true, might have
aw'd

aw'd us into obedience by the splendor of his presence, or the terror of his voice ; but, certainly, a person of our own system, must needs be allow'd the best instrument to insinuate instruction into us, or by gentle persuasion work upon creatures like himself. The reason is apparent : because, being himself intimately acquainted with all the springs of the human soul, he must be quite sensible of the best manner of applying to them, and giving them, under God, the desir'd influence or motion.

BUT this leads us to extend the question, and to be yet more particular on this latter part of it. For we may farther ask : How does it appear, that the instructing us by a super-angelical minister, would be either *so worthy* the DIVINE Being himself, or so much to *the benefit* of us, his human, reasonable creatures ? For, in respect, first, to THE ALMIGHTY, how would it reflect to his honour in point of wisdom or goodness, to deal with us by a superior hand, rather than one on a level with ourselves, abstractly consider'd, or all divinity absolutely apart ? For, when we are to determine in respect of his wisdom, we may be assur'd, that THE ALMIGHTY will never put himself to unnecessary expence ; or, which is the same thing, will never degrade himself so far, as to call in extraordinary means to his assistance, if he can effect his designs as well, not to say better, by those, which are common only. Here therefore the advantage must be evidently on our side of the question :
because,

because, the weaker the instrument, the greater will be the display both of the divine wisdom and power in the use of it. So again, secondly, with respect to the divine goodness: How would that gain, on the supposition of a super-angelical prophet? So far from it, that it cannot but suffer on that principle. Because, the more **THE ALMIGHTY** condescends to the natural frame and capacity of the creature he designs to instruct and save; the more does it illustrate his character as a benevolent and gracious superintendent.

HENCE then, we naturally descend to the other part of the question: namely, what concerns *our own benefit*. And how is this best promoted? by a man, instructing us; or, by an angel? A small share of discerning readily determines this question, likewise, in our favour. Because, as that, which is most suitable to our own nature, will always be most acceptable to us: so, it will follow, that we shall be more like to improve under the tuition of a person of the same order or species, with ourselves; than under that of another, essentially different from us, and prodigiously our superior.

HEREIN therefore we see, not only our own advantage secur'd, in the best manner and to the highest degree; but also, both the wisdom and goodness of **ALMIGHTY GOD**, receiving their full lustre. Since, having took such measures for our growth in spiritual wisdom, as are intirely proportionate to our nature; he

I

appears,

appears, in the exactest manner possible, to have adapted the instrument to the work ; or, the person, who is to teach, to the disposition of those, who are to be taught : than which nothing can be either more wise, or generous.—But this being fact ; how can we form a juster conclusion, than that OUR blessed SAVIOUR, in consequence of his PROPHEITICAL character, is a real man, and not a substance super-angelical ?

5. LASTLY, Does not this principle [*the humanity of OUR SAVIOUR*] not only secure, but best account for that distinction, which the scriptures every where make between *The Christian* and *legal oeconomy* ; giving the former eminently the advantage in respect of *the person revealing*, as well as *the matter revealed*?—*The law*, says St. Paul, was *ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator* ; meaning *Moses* ¹. For which reason, the same apostle, in another place, stiles it *the word spoken by angels* ². —THE ALMIGHTY, indeed, under that state, spoke to the church by *divers ways*, or *manners* ³ ; but this, of *the ministry of angels*, was the most steady and august. These, in particular, conveyed the intelligence, or publish'd *the law* in articulate sounds, call'd *the voice of words*, at mount *Sinai* (which, I presume, is the instance the apostle here immediately refers to :) these rais'd, moreover, that solemn apparatus of *fire, blackness, darkness* and *tempest*,

¹ Gal. iii. 19.
ch. i. 1.

² Heb. ii. 2.

³ Ibid.

and

and *the sound of a trumpet* ¹. But, what is the state of the case, respecting the new-testament dispensation? By whom does ALMIGHTY GOD now speak to the church? In this, again, *Paul* particularly informs us by saying: that *he hath in these last days* spoken unto us by HIS SON ².

THERE is then, I presume, some notable distinction, between GOD'S SON, by whom he now speaks to us; and *the angels*, by whom he spake, principally, to them under *the law*. And this distinction is design'd to convey some idea of pre-eminence in the latter state, above what obtain'd in the former. Do we want scriptural proof in these cases? We shall find then the distinction itself by those words: *Unto the angels has he [GOD] not put in subjection the world to come [beginning in the present Christian state] whereof we speak* ³. And for the pre-eminence, that text is equally peremptory: *If the word spoken by angels was stedfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompence of reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation, which, at the first, began to be spoken by THE LORD* ⁴.

WHEREFORE, these being facts, what remains is to account for them. And here, the evidence, I imagine, arises from the very words, in which these respective declarations are made. ALMIGHTY GOD speaks to us *not by the angels*; but by HIS SON, by THE LORD

¹ Ibid. ch. xii. 18, 19.
ch. ii. 5.

² Ibid. ch. i. 2.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid. ver. 2, 3.

from heaven. Is not this sufficient to prove to us, that THIS SON is something distinct from, and superior to, the angels; particularly, in the discharge of this his PROPHETICAL character? But, if personally distinct from ~~them~~, it must be that, *according to the flesh*, he is precisely a man. And then, his being charged with a more excellent dispensation of things; and being himself LORD in his house, and therefore retaining the angels, as servants under him; are, surely, considerations sufficient to demonstrate his superiority, as this distinct person; that is, as man. For here we behold *the man* CHRIST [THE MEDIATOR] acting no longer *by deputation*; but discharging the business of his PROPHETICAL character in his own person; which must needs add the last weight to the Christian dispensation.

NOT to allow this reasoning, would be to confound the new-testament state intirely with the legal. For, if CHRIST be only an angel, though at the head of that order, or all the orders of angels universally; it is plain the administration would still be in the same hands: namely, those of *Michael* and the angels, *his ministers*; which would, at once, destroy that disproportion, which, avowedly, obtains between the two states.

AND yet, more especially, would this be the case, on your lordship's supposition, that *Gabriel* is THE HOLY GHOST. Because, as all the great concerns of the new testament, under CHRIST; this of instruction, in particular;
are

are devolv'd on THE HOLY GHOST: it would then evidently follow, that the new-testament state of things is wholly given-up into the hands of angels; contrary to what we have elsewhere shewn, to be the sense of holy scripture on this subject'.——And this by the way, is a good argument against that part of your lordship's hypothesis. I come now,

III. To take some notice of OUR SAVIOUR as vested with REGAL AUTHORITY, as the last of those three characters, by which he especially acts in quality of MEDIATOR; and therefore as the last medium reserv'd for argument on this part of the subject.

NOW, as to OUR SAVIOUR'S being A KING, as well as A PROPHET and PRIEST; he is such in a double sense: namely, first, by nature; and, secondly, by office.

I. OUR SAVIOUR has a right to this character *by nature*; or, if that be not sufficiently explicit, by virtue of *natural relation*, as well to THE ALMIGHTY on the one part, as to the creature in general, on the other.

I BEGIN the account here, because, as there must of necessity be a person before there can be an office; so, it is a principle with me, to conclude that OUR LORD'S first, or supreme right to KINGLY POWER, is founded in *his person*, rather than suspended intirely on his office. —There was, doubtless, THE SON, *before* there was A MEDIATOR. The question then is:

¹ See above, p. 80.

Who, or what, was THAT SON? Some prerogatives, surely, were essential to his nature; prior to, and distinct from, *his constitution*. And from hence, I presume, our estimate of CHRIST is to commence. And, that holy scripture warrants a conclusion of this kind, is to me very evident from that single text, taken in it's spiritual reference (though it might be argued from a great variety ¹;) where, THE ALMIGHTY speaks of THE MEDIATOR in the following terms: *I have laid help upon one that IS MIGHTY* [in his own person; meaning, previous to his being charged with office. For this, CHRIST, undoubtedly, was, as to his heavenly original; however mean his descent, or birth, was among men ².] Here then is the seat of the honour itself; the foundation, on which it is rais'd: namely, the intrinsic glory of OUR SAVIOUR'S person, or private nature, whatever it be.

BUT then to acquaint ourselves more particularly with *the manner*, how this honour becomes his property, or devolves upon him, we must take into the account the double relation mention'd above.—Now here, that branch of it which affects THE DIVINE BEING depends on the privilege of *primogeniture* [including the manner of his production;] while the other branch of it, which involves universal nature,

¹ See particularly Prov. viii. 22——31. And all those scriptures, which speak of his existence *prior* to all created beings whatever.

² Pf. lxxxix. 19.

takes place by right of creation, or, however, commences with it : I speak here of creation in general.—With regard to the former of these, THE ALMIGHTY speaks, saying : *I will make him my first-born, bigger than the kings of the earth*¹. Again, on the same principle, he is call'd *the beir of all things*² : and is said by inheritance to have obtain'd a more excellent name, than that of *the angels*³.—And then, in reference to the latter, that is, creation ; the text says : *Thou, LORD, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth ; and the heavens are the works of thy hands*⁴. On which principle likewise [in part, at least] he is stiled God, and has a *throne* assign'd him⁵. But then, additional to this branch of the subject we have to observe farther :

2. THAT CHRIST IS KING by office, or appointment, as well as by natural relation. THE FATHER hath given all power into his hands⁶ : hath put the government upon his shoulders⁷ : hath constituted him head over all things for the church⁸. This is what we more strictly call *his mediatorial kingdom*, and is what, he may, in a sense, be said to have atchiev'd himself ; this dominion being properly the consequence or reward of his humiliation, obedience and sacrifice ; and is that, with which we are here more particularly concern'd.

¹ Ibid. ver. 27.² Heb. i. 2.³ Ibid. ver. 4.⁴ Ibid. ver. 10.⁵ Ibid. ver. 8.⁶ Matth. xxviii. 18.⁷ Isa. ix. 6.⁸ Eph. i. 22.

As to the other, indeed, which, for distinction-sake, we may call *his natural kingdom*, or that, which he holds *by inheritance* [and which, I therefore suppose, he must have held, whether he had been charged with office, or not: as to *this natural kingdom*] we have already proved his right to it, and his possession of it [in part] as a branch of humanity, under a preceding head: namely, where we shew'd, that he is emphatically *that man*, and *that great son of man*, to whom the grant of *universal dominion* was originally made. And which, I presume, agreeable to the scriptures above, might, in part, be made to him on account of his singular production, as GOD's *only begotten son*¹: [none of GOD's other sons having the same original with CHRIST.] And, again, in part, on account of his share in the works of creation; which likewise gives him a kind of natural claim to this dominion: for as much as all persons and things, are properly his creatures. Not but his share in creation, may also be consider'd, in a degree, at least, as a necessary appendage of his nature; which means, in other words, as a privilege arising from, or strictly connected with his person, as the only production of the kind: a consideration, which cannot but give him, at the same time, both a Superiority of nature, and a pre-eminence in character. But passing these things, as either sufficiently consider'd above; or, as not so directly to our present purpose;

¹ 1 John i. 14.

we proceed to examine OUR SAVIOUR'S claim to the REGAL character in the other, and lower view of the subject.

AND that CHRIST is KING by virtue of *institution* or *appointment* from THE FATHER, his glorious constituent ; and that he sustains this character in the precise capacity of *a man*, or as a branch of the human nature ; will admit of full proof from the three following considerations : namely,

1.) THAT no nature, but the human, will be found *proper*, or *suitable*, to the present office ; whether consider'd as taking place among *ourselves*, or the *other orders* of created beings. Again,

2.) FOR as much as no nature, but the human, could fulfil *the conditions*, on which the legal claim to this character, and a public investiture with it, were suspended by ALMIGHTY GOD. And then,

3.) ALL CHRIST'S *transactions* in quality of KING, appear to be founded in his humanity, or to take their rise from, what he is in his person, or has done and suffer'd, *as man*. Let us then examine these several arguments distinctly. Wherefore,

1.) FIRST of all : it will appear, that CHRIST sustains this character, *as man* ; because the human is the alone nature, *truly suitable* to this glorious office ; not only in reference to ourselves, but the whole system of creatures universally. To evidence this, let it only be consider'd, that CHRIST'S KINGLY office

is merely one branch of his general character as MEDIATOR. But, that being allow'd, permit me, to save unnecessary enlargement, to refer to what has been suggested above on that article 1. Because, as we there proved, that none but the human, as *a middle nature*, can be personally qualified to execute that charge; and it is certain, that the KINGLY office of CHRIST is merely a title subservient to that general work; it cannot but follow, that *that*, which appears to be true of *the whole*, must needs hold good of *a part* likewise.—If the human, be the only nature, suitable to the business of A MEDIATOR; and we can be certain (as we are from holy scriptures) that CHRIST is THE alone MEDIATOR between GOD and us: we may, at the same time, be certain, that he sustains the present character of KING, as part of the *mediatorial* office; on the same foot, that he sustains *the whole* of that office: which is to prove immediately, that he is neither angel, nor arch-angel; but man, as we are ourselves. But then,

2.) THE LIKE appears from *the conditions*, he was to discharge in order to pave his way to a full, legal investiture with the KINGLY office, in this branch of it. Is it ask'd, What were these? I answer:

(1.) IN the first place, it was requir'd, that *he should be made of a woman, and be made under the law*; which intends, not only that he should become incarnate, or cloath himself with

a body of our make ; but also, that he should, in that body, yield a punctual and plenary obedience to the law, in quality of an human creature. Because, if he was not to yield obedience in that quality, or under that precise notion, there can be no possible reason, why he should be made conformable to our nature in both the above respects. Wherefore, his being thus made conformable, is as strong a proof, as we can have, that he is absolutely of the same nature with ourselves. But to be a little more particular : we have here both the quality of the person, who is to obey ; and the precise circumstance, under which he is to perform this obedience.

As to *the person* then ; where do we hear of a production of this kind, that is, a being *made of a woman*, from among the angels, or any of the orders above that nature ? Is not holy scripture an intire stranger to a doctrine of this sort ?——We read, indeed, of THE WORD's being *made flesh* ¹. But THIS WORD, I think, was *the creator* of all persons and things, *visible* and *invisible* ². He therefore, who formed the angels of all Ranks, and, consequently, *Michael* among the rest ; can never be that archangel, himself. Because, according to your lordship's own principles, a superior nature only, is to be supposed capable of creating an inferior. And that CHRIST is superior to all, even *Michael*, the arch-angel, is evident from his having himself created the whole

¹ John i. 14.

² Col. i. 16.

angelical system.—Not but, were we to allow THIS WORD to be originally super-angelical ; I see not, by what art, we shall be able to continue this same nature, when once he comes *to be made of a woman*. For it is, I think, a general receiv'd maxim : that *every like produces it's like*. He therefore, that *is made of a woman*, must, I suppose, be a partaker of the same nature with the woman ; and, consequently, be *a man*, as we are. For, what is it, *to be made of a woman* ? The expression, I apprehend, intends not only, that the person, so form'd, takes the material part of his nature, which is what we call the body, from her ; but that, as a necessary prerequisite to his assumption of that body, he also shares the other part of our nature, the spirit or soul : intimating therefore, that he is, on the whole, a production of that kind, which is commonly known to be born of a woman. If this be not allowed, we must be obliged to pronounce it an unnatural production ; a creature of an heterogeneous kind ; and therefore one, who can have nothing to do within the limits of our sphere. Relation and proportion must be allowed ; if not, a general confusion inevitably follows.

THIS, however, is barely one part of the present condition. For, besides his being *made of a woman*, it is farther requir'd, that this person *be made under the law* ; meaning, as above, under an obligation to observe the injunctions, or precepts of that law, which is peculiar

peculiar to the human species. But, was it ever heard, that either angel or arch-angel, was thus reduced, and, as I may say, metamorphosed ; first, in regard of person, and next, in point of circumstance ?—— Not but we must here, likewise, make a question of the possibility of the case. Which is : how the bringing a super-angelical spirit under a state of subjection to those laws, which are purely human, can, by any means, comport with the eternal, immutable nature of things. Have not the several orders of created beings their own distinguishing laws ? Wherefore, before we can suppose, an angel, or arch-angel, brought down to the circumstance of a man, in this particular view ; we must, surely, likewise suppose, that his nature is absolutely changed : the plain consequence of which is, that he is then no longer that super-angelical creature, but a creature of our own rank. But, that a transformation of this kind is utterly impossible, is from hence apparent : that to introduce a principle of this sort, would be to break-in upon that invincible barrier, by which the various species of creatures are kept at an eternal distance from each other. There being, however, no method but this left, for his becoming a man ; and, it being also clear from this reasoning, that none, but man, can be made under the laws of men : What follows ? That *Michael*, the archangel, can never be a person qualified, according to the present account ;

count; and therefore, can never wear the REGAL office among us.

BEING then here plainly non-plust; what is our resource? Where shall we, at last, find the person, who answers to the present description? the person, alone capable of submitting to *the present conditions*? The answer is, JESUS, and him only. For GOD himself, by the mouth of his holy apostle St. Paul, hath given us this testimony of him: that *he was both made of a woman, and made under the law*¹ — CHRIST, in the fulness of time, became incarnate of the virgin *Mary*, and obeyed the precepts of the law, in it's utmost extent and rigour. What then is the inference? That he has, by this means, certainly given us one of the best reasons in the world to conclude, that he is man, as we are, and no other; neither angel, nor archangel. Hence therefore it is, that the text peremptorily declares, that as by *one man's* disobedience, *many were made sinners*; so, by the obedience of *one*, shall many be *made righteous*² — And thus, again, it appears, that the nature obeying the law, is the same with that, which had broken it: the necessity of which is apparently founded in the nature of the thing. Unless we can be so absurd, not to say blasphemous, as to suppose, that THE ALMIGHTY hath given forth a law to the human, reasonable creature, to no other purpose, than that it might be broken; but not fulfil'd by

¹ Gal. iv. 4.

² Rom. v. 19.

[any of] that order of being.—Here then is *the first condition*, fulfil'd in *the person* of CHRIST; and therefore, not only proof given of his true humanity; but also, a way opened for his acquiring the REGAL dignity, as MEDIATOR. To this we add

2. ANOTHER condition, necessary in the present case, which is: that having, first, obeyed *the precept* of the law; he is, in the next place, to undergo *the penalty* of it. To the former he submits, both as a creature [that is, *as man, made under the law himself*] and as a public head; and to the latter, he submits intirely for the sake of the church, as their substitute or surety.—The reason for this, is, that ALMIGHTY GOD having the last regard to his most holy and righteous law, had determined, that the great ends, for which he had establish'd it, should not be lost. Now these ends were two. The first and principal, that it's precepts should be fulfil'd: the second and inferior, that, in case of disobedience, it's penalty should be suffer'd. The former we have seen accomplish'd above, in the obedience of CHRIST. For which Reason, he is said, to be *the* [fulfilling] *end* of the law *for righteousness to every one, that believeth* . The latter we are now inquiring after.

It being then certain, that this law was set-up, purely, for the human nature, we shall observe the same reason for the penalty's being suffer'd by one of that nature, as there was

for the precept's being fulfil'd. And, for the necessity of it, on the part of THE ALMIGHTY, it was ; that he could not, in a consistency with himself, dispense with the sanctions of his own law. And, on our part, it was impossible, we should acquire a state of future happiness, at the same time, that the law was against us, and pronounced a sentence of condemnation upon us. *This* then was the obstacle in the way : because (after taking into the account OUR SAVIOUR'S obedience, as above) this sentence of condemnation being removed ; it is evident, the law could not only acquit us from guilt, but absolutely pronounce us righteous.

THAT this great end has been accomplish'd, holy scripture assures us. But, by whom, is the question ? Could we then accomplish it in our own persons ? Very far from it. That were always to suffer, and never to be sav'd. Because *death*, as *the proper wages of sin*¹, is perpetually intail'd on the person sinning. It rises strictly from *the ratio* of the sentence itself.—Can it be done by a super-angelical spirit ? A supposition of that kind is contrary to the nature of the thing. For how can one, out of the verge of the human nature, either obey, or suffer *for* [or, *as*] that nature ?——To whom then can we turn in this case ? unless it be to *the man* CHRIST ; that branch of our nature, who is call'd *the man of God's right hand*, and *the son of man*, whom *he had*

¹ Rom. vi. 23.

*made strong for himself*¹: that is, I apprehend, among other purposes; *strong* to bear the penalty of the law, as well as obey it's precepts, for the body of that species, under whose law he had been made, and with a view to which sufferings, he was apparently so made. Hence it is, that we have that testimony by the apostle: CHRIST *hath redeemed us from the curse of the law* [which is death] *being made a curse for us*². But, if he has *redeemed us* [men] by suffering *that curse*, which should have fallen upon ourselves; it is then certain, that he must be of the same nature with us, the creature sinning. Because, as the law hath not the least pretension for inflicting punishment on any nature, but what had transgress'd it (which is avowedly the human;) so neither can it declare itself satisfied in the sufferings of any nature, but the human. For the sentence lies against *our nature*, and *that only*.

WHAT then, can be more distant from the point, and therefore more inconsistent with the truth of things, than that the human nature should *sin*, but the angelical nature *suffer*? Where is the affinity to justify a substitution, or to procure an atonement? But that these things comport with the character and passion of OUR SAVIOUR, is from hence evident: that GOD is said to *have sent him*, HIS SON, to be *the propitiation for our sins*³. Which, if it mean any thing, must mean, that by his being

¹ Ps. lxxx. 17.
iv. 10.

² Gal. iii. 13.

³ 1 John

for the precept's being fulfil'd. And, for the necessity of it, on the part of THE ALMIGHTY, it was ; that he could not, in a consistency with himself, dispense with the sanctions of his own law. And, on our part, it was impossible, we should acquire a state of future happiness, at the same time, that the law was against us, and pronounced a sentence of condemnation upon us. *This* then was the obstacle in the way : because (after taking into the account OUR SAVIOUR'S obedience, as above) this sentence of condemnation being removed ; it is evident, the law could not only acquit us from guilt, but absolutely pronounce us righteous.

THAT this great end has been accomplish'd, holy scripture assures us. But, by whom, is the question ? Could we then accomplish it in our own persons ? Very far from it. That were always to suffer, and never to be sav'd. Because *death*, as *the proper wages of sin*¹, is perpetually intail'd on the person sinning. It rises strictly from *the ratio* of the sentence itself.—Can it be done by a super-angelical spirit ? A supposition of that kind is contrary to the nature of the thing. For how can one, out of the verge of the human nature, either obey, or suffer *for* [or, *as*] that nature ?——To whom then can we turn in this case ? unless it be to *the man* CHRIST ; that branch of our nature, who is call'd *the man of God's right hand*, and *the son of man*, whom he had

¹ Rom. vi. 23.

*made strong for himself*¹: that is, I apprehend, among other purposes; *strong* to bear *the penalty* of the law, as well as obey it's *precepts*, for the body of that species, under whose law he had been made, and with a view to which sufferings, he was apparently so made. Hence it is, that we have that testimony by the apostle: CHRIST *hath redeemed us from the curse of the law* [which is *death*] *being made a curse for us*². But, if he has *redeemed us* [men] by suffering *that curse*, which should have fallen upon ourselves; it is then certain, that he must be of the same nature with us, the creature fining. Because, as the law hath not the least pretension for inflicting punishment on any nature, but what had transgress'd it (which is avowedly the human;) so neither can it declare itself satisfied in the sufferings of any nature, but the human. For the sentence lies against *our nature*, and *that only*.

WHAT then, can be more distant from the point, and therefore more inconsistent with the truth of things, than that the human nature should *sin*, but the angelical nature *suffer*? Where is the affinity to justify a substitution, or to procure an atonement? But that these things comport with the character and passion of OUR SAVIOUR, is from hence evident: that GOD is said to *have sent him*, HIS SON, to be *the propitiation for our sins*³. Which, if it mean any thing, must mean, that by his being

¹ Ps. lxxx. 17.
iv. 10.

² Gal. iii. 13.

³ 1 John

the head of the human nature, and suffering, *as a sacrifice*, in the room of that nature ; we, of the human species, acquire *remission of our sins* ¹.

IT is granted, as part of the truth, that CHRIST died in confirmation of his doctrine. But, were this the whole truth, many of the most clear and positive declarations on this subject [the nature and end of CHRIST's death] as well of the old testament, as of the new, must be immediately struck out ; either as a banter on language, or an affront to our senses. Because they must be found, on any other principle, either untrue in themselves, or unintelligible to us. For, what are we to suppose meant, by THE FATHER's *laying our iniquities upon him*, and by *his bearing the sin of many* ² ? by *his dying*, as a sacrifice, for us ³ ? by *his blood's being the price of our redemption* ⁴ ? and by it's being said, that *we have*, through him, *received the atonement* ⁵ ? I repeat the question : What are we to make of these several expressions ? if their design be not to inform us, that CHRIST died in a legal way, as the head and substitute of our nature ; bearing that punishment, which must, otherwise, have fallen on the whole nature itself. And to what other purpose, is that prophetic speech of *Caiphas* to the *Jewish council* ? *Ye know nothing at all, nor consider, that it is expedient for us, that one*

¹ See Rom. iii. 25. Eph. i. 7.
12. 1 Pet. ii. 24. ³ Eph. v. 2.
18, 19. ⁵ Rom. v. 11.

² Isa. liii. 6,
⁴ 1 Pet. i.

*man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not*¹.

WHEREFORE, in this respect, again, the propriety holds. For as much as the same nature, which had violated the law, is here made a sacrifice to it. So that, taking in OUR LORD'S obedience from the preceding head [as it includes *the purity* of his nature] and his passion or sufferings under this; we have an opportunity of observing, that the divine law has been punctually obliged in all it's demands. And, consequently, where it can exact no more, we may say, with strict truth, that *it has been satisfied*, or, that *satisfaction has been made*.——Thus then, we have a *second condition*, the penalty of *the law*, suffer'd by CHRIST, as a proof of his being truly human, and as a farther step to his *mediatorial, KINGLY office*. But we add to this

(3.) As mankind had been brought under a state of *bondage*, on the introduction of sin, by our first parents; so, it was incumbent on CHRIST, as a means to prepare fit materials for his spiritual kingdom, that he should *recover* his subjects from under *this foreign jurisdiction*. Here then we have a third condition.

THAT this is the true situation of all mankind, in their natural circumstances, will appear, on a *comparative view* of the relation, which has, by this means, been unhappily introduced between *satan* and the human na-

¹ John xi. 49, 50.

ture.—For, with respect to *satan*, he is, on this account, represented as having a *dominion*, and *ruling over* the unconverted part of mankind, as a monarch over his subjects or vassals¹: and is likewise said to be *that spirit*, which now *worketh in the children of disobedience*². On the other hand, in perfect correspondence with the above accounts, mankind, in their lapsed circumstances, are said to be *taken captive by the devil*³. And are represented as persons *under the power of satan*⁴; and, when they are recover'd from this vassalage, they are said to *awake out of the snare of the devil*⁵; and to be *deliver'd from the power of darkness*, and *translated into the kingdom of God's dear SON*⁶; as a dominion absolutely opposed to that of *satan*: with other descriptions of like import.

THIS therefore, being the state of the human nature, in consequence of *the fall*; it is very evident, that it is necessary, some extraordinary efforts be made for the recovery of these persons out of the hands of *satan*, before they can become the subjects of CHRIST's kingdom, in a gracious, or spiritual sense. Do we then find, that any one has enter'd the lists with this *Leviathan* of power⁶, and disputed the present possession? Hear we of any one, that hath attack'd *this strong man arm'd*, divested him of *his armour*, and *divided the spoils of the fall*

¹ Matth. xii. 26. Luke xi. 18.

² 2 Tim. ii. 26.

⁴ Acts xxvi. 18.

³ Eph. ii. 2.

⁵ Col. i. 13.

⁶ Isa. xxvii. 1.

with

with him : ?——In a variety of places. Not but it is sufficient for our present purpose, to observe, that it is expressly declared to be the great end of OUR SAVIOUR's appearance among us, that *he might destroy the works of the devil*¹; and, consequently, *the kingdom*, which he had erected in the world. And that he has herein succeeded, is evident from the account given us by St. Paul, which informs us, that CHRIST *has spoiled principalities and powers, and has made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in his death upon the cross*². And, as the last evidence of it, we learn from the same apostle, that, *when he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive*³. Meaning, that he now, in a manner yet more glorious, than that on the cross, triumph'd over *satan*, together with all the enemies of the church in a body; and therefore, that a multitude of captives graced his magnificent ascension.——These then are absolute facts. Mankind are naturally *in bondage to satan*, and OUR LORD came to effect their spiritual release.

It having then been proved, that OUR blessed SAVIOUR has succeeded in this great undertaking; the inquiry, which naturally follows, is this: In *what quality* has he brought it about? Whether as a super-angelical spirit, or, as a branch of the human nature? Not in the former capacity: for that one, plain reason (which, though often mention'd, has still a

¹ Matth. xii. 29. Luke xi. 22.

² 1 John iii. 8.

³ Col. ii. 15.

⁴ Eph. iv. 8.

right to be introduced ;) namely, that such a super-angelical spirit, having no relation to us, the human species ; cannot but want *the first and fundamental qualification*, necessary to a service of this kind.—Let it, however, be also consider'd, that if that spirit, who is stiled *Michael*, the archangel, could neither, by virtue of his own personal strength, or any official power delegated to him, heretofore repel *Samael* (as the rabbins call the prince of the devils) when disputing about the body of *Moses* ; but, as we have seen above, was obliged to appeal to THE ALMIGHTY himself, for the exertion of his immediate, superior influence : how shall we reconcile it to common reason to suppose, that he should be capable of quelling the whole body of devils ; all the infernal powers in general ? All of them conspiring to perpetuate *the natural bondage* of the human species. And yet this, we are assur'd, has been done by CHRIST ; as a full proof, I imagine, that OUR LORD is not only distinct from, but greatly superior to, the archangel, literally called *Michael*.—But this is not all : for it is farther to be consider'd by *what means*, and by *what steps*, OUR blessed SAVIOUR has effected this rescue.

Now, in the general, this has been done by *his death* upon the cross. But, have we not proved in the above sheets, that none could suffer successfully for the human nature, but one, and he the head, of that nature ? If *man*, through transgression of the law, run himself into the power of *satan* ; the reason of things

tells

tells us, that none, but a branch of that nature, could so answer the demands of the law, as effectually to dissolve that power.—Not that it has yet been proved, nor, indeed, can, either that angel, or archangel, was ever incarnate; or, if he were, that he suffer'd, or could suffer, from *that law*, which is calculated intirely for us, the human species. But it has been shewn, on the contrary, that a supposition of that kind, is inconsistent with the nature of things. Because, as spirits of that exalted order, cannot be made *under our law*; so, neither can the functions of it, by any means, reach them.

AGAIN, to make the point rather more express: What is *the chain* that holds mankind in captivity to *satan*? The answer is, *sin* or *moral evil*; the very means by which, they were at first thrown into his hands. The indictment against us stood fully represented by all the services of the *levitical* priesthood. These loudly witness'd to the guilt of the human nature, and appeal'd, at the same time, from *the blood* of *bulls* and of *calves*¹; as utterly insufficient to make expiation. The reason for which is, that the death of a brute bears no proportion, to the sin of a man. Whose then is the prevalent oblation? CHRIST's: who is therefore called *the propitiation for our sins*². And has it not been proved under a preceding head, that he must of necessity be herein consider'd, as a branch of our nature? Because

¹ Heb. ix. 12, 13.

² 1 John ii. 2.

man, and no other, can be a proper and valid sacrifice, in the room of man. BEYOND this subject, OUR LAW pretends to *no claim*. Loaded too, as the indictment is, on this side, OUR SAVIOUR has effectually quashed it. Therefore the text assures us, that *he has blotted out the hand-writing of ordinances* [abolish'd each ceremonial rite] *that was against us* [as they were so many evidences to our guilt] *which was contrary to us* [as they consign'd us to death, and call'd for the execution of it upon us] *and took it out of the way, nailing it to HIS CROSS*¹. The efficacy then, still results from the blood of the cross; and that still loudly attests his humanity.

AGAIN: as a farther proof of his success on this occasion, he is said: *to have finished the transgression, and to have made an end of sin*². Here then the chain is intirely dissolved: the fetters for ever broken: and this by MESSIAH, *the prince*³. But THE MESSIAH, the LORD *from heaven*, we have before seen, is a branch of the human nature; being one, *chosen out of the people*; that is, either from among mankind in general, or from the body of the Jews in particular.

ONCE more: *What was it, that bound the reasonable human creature down in this state of bondage?* The righteous sentence of the law. Has it not then been proved, that none could so undergo this sentence, as to avert it effectually

¹ Col. ii. 14.² Dan. ix. 24.³ Ver.

ally from the party offending, but CHRIST? And that he could no other way accomplish it, than as he was *the substitute* of the church? He being therefore *made of a woman*, and *made under the law*, that, by bearing the sentence itself in his own person, as the head of the human nature, he might compleatly *deliver us from the curse*¹; and, consequently, destroy that one thing, which gave *satan* his whole advantage over us.

LASTLY, To bring the subject to a point: let it be farther inquir'd, *Who* is the person, that exercises *the tyranny* annex't to the present usurpation on the human, reasonable creature? Or, to *whom* is committed *the application* of every terror, that the sentence of death, when fully impress'd, is capable of producing in the mind of an awaken'd sinner? I answer, *satan* himself is this busy, turbulent adversary; his is *the power of death*, in this case, as the apostle expresses it²: that is, *the power* of making *the apprehension of death*, as the just demerit of sin, *terrible* to the guilty conscience.—Well, is the sentence of the law revers'd? Is death disarm'd of it's sting? Is this dreadful power wrested from the hands of *satan*? Nothing is more true. The thing is already done by CHRIST: and shall be punctually applied to the respective subjects of his kingdom in the stated periods of time [though, in some cases, indeed, it may be defer'd till the article of death:] CHRIST, I say, has done it; and this

¹ Gal. iii. 13.

² Heb. ii. 14.

as man, as a branch of our nature.—Are the inquiries? By what means? How does it appear?

THE ANSWER to the first question is: by his having taken a true, human body into personal union with his pre-existent spirit or soul. By this means, giving ocular demonstration, that we are all of one family; and therefore, that he has it in his power, even on the foot of natural composition or structure, to call us *brethren*, and to consider us as *children*, together with himself. Nor does it rest here, we having it farther to observe, that OUR LORD'S design, in thus uniting both parts of our nature in his person, was no other, than that he might be exactly in a capacity, to do those things for us, which it was not in our power to do for ourselves. Such, for example, as those mention'd above; his obeying *the precept*, and undergoing *the penalty* of the law.— Having then, as this complete human system, gone through both, what will the necessary consequence be? That all accusations from the law are silenc'd; that sin has intirely lost it's strength; that death is effectually dispossest of it's sting, and, therefore, in the last place, *satan* wholly despoil'd of this part of his armour; the part, which carried the most terrible aspect with it to the spiritual convict.

AND then, in answer to the second question, that he has done all this, as a branch of our own nature, evidently appears, not only from what has been already suggested under the two

last

last particulars; but also from the apostle's *reasoning*, in this second chapter of *the Hebrews*, on this very subject. For I take, what has been now advanc'd, to be the full purport of what we find at the 14th verse: *For as much then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood* [their being *children*, only CHRIST the first-born, and they the younger sons, as we have observ'd before, bespeaks them all of the same nature; and his partaking of *flesh and blood*, confining the terms more strictly to the *body*, is only an intimation, that he possess'd the human spirit or soul *from everlasting*; and that he therefore took *flesh and blood*, under a circumstance of subjection to our law, that being thus a compleat man in both his constituent parts; he might, on the one hand, answer to the *personal structure*; and, on the other, put himself in the *legal capacity*, of the human nature. *For as much then, as the children were partakers of flesh and blood*] *he also himself likewise, or, in like manner*¹, *took part of the same*: [But, with what design?] *that through death he might destroy him, that had the power of death, that is, the devil.*—What therefore can be more plain, than that the foundation of this triumph is laid in his death? But, if it lie there, it must be, because he is a branch of the human nature, so qualified as to be capable of answering all the demands the law had on *his brethren*. Those demands then having been evidently answer'd by him *as man*, and *such*

¹ Παραπλησίως.

only;

only; he must also in that quality, have set all his subjects at liberty: as, from the curse of the law itself; so, likewise, from *the terror of death*, on the one hand, and *the tyranny of jatan* on the other. There being always reason, or cause enough for both in the death of CHRIST, whether the application be actually made to the present satisfaction of the christian, or not.

THUS then we see, neither angel, nor archangel, any way concern'd in this great Work; but that the whole of it is to be resolv'd into the glorious atchievements of THE CROSS. From whence we have the highest reason to argue, both for the truth of OUR SAVIOUR'S humanity, and for his having legal claim to the honour of the KINGLY office, as MEDIATOR. Once more,

(4.) As a farther condition preparatory to this honour, it was necessary, that he should *conquer death*, or *triumph over the grave*.—Has he not then done this also? The proof is indisputable by his own resurrection. For, as St. Peter saies: *GOD hath raised him up, having loosed the pains of death: because it was not possible, that he should be holden of it*¹. This, at the same time, is a full assurance, for the future general resurrection; on which it will be literally said, in regard to *the just*, more particularly: *death is swallowed up in victory*; and, consequently, the apostle's triumphant challenge take place in it's utmost extent: *O death*,

¹ Acts ii. 24.

where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? Thanks be to GOD, who giveth us the victory, through OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST ¹.

HERE then we see, both *death* and *the grave* vanquished by OUR blessed SAVIOUR. Is it said, how so? or, in what nature? as one, *super-angelical*; or, as one, *truly human*? The text will again speak for us, being very peremptory in the case: *For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead*.— This then is a testimony, from which there can be no appeal. For, I presume, we shall meet with none so extravagant, as to assert; that the word *man* hath different meanings, in the different parts of this verse; or, that it is to signify *a man* properly, in the former member; but *a super-angelical spirit*, in the latter. It being then allowed, that the text speaks of one and the same nature, and that, the human; it is *a general proof* for the whole. “ For we
“ can be sure of nothing, if we may not be
“ sure of this: that OUR LORD is absolutely
“ *the same* throughout his *whole mediatorial*
“ *work*, that he is in *any one, single part* of it.
“ If, therefore, he be truly, and properly *man*,
“ in this grand branch of it, *the resurrection*
“ *of the dead*; he is *certainly such*, wherever
“ he appears: and *not a man in one part*, and
“ *a super-angelical nature in another*. ”

IF any inquire more particularly into *the ratio* of this act, or *the means*, by which OUR LORD's *rising from the dead*, becomes an argu-

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 54, 55, 57.

² Ibid. ver 21.

ment in proof of his humanity ; it evidently lies here : That, as THE MEDIATOR'S *rising again* from the dead, was absolutely suspended on the previous fulfilment of all covenant-conditions ; and it hath been proved, that those conditions could be alone fulfil'd, by a branch of the human nature : that CHRIST *did* actually *rise again*, is, consequently, a proof, not only that he had fulfil'd all those conditions ; but, likewise, that he was truly and properly a man.—CHRIST, we have seen, is *our surety* ; as *man* ; therefore engaged for the payment of our debts (state them as we will :) by *his burial* then, he may be consider'd as *cast into prison*, as the last part of his obligation. But, if he paid our debts, and submitted to imprisonment, *as man* (that being the alone nature proper to these cases ;) it is certain, that he, who *rose again*, was the same with him, that was *buried* : but the one was *a man*, therefore the other.

THUS then has OUR SAVIOUR, *as man*, perform'd all the conditions requir'd by HIS FATHER, his glorious constituent ; necessary to give him a present legal claim, and hereafter secure him a full and public investiture with the REGAL character. It remains, however, that we subjoin to this evidence, such additional proof as may arise.

3.) FROM the consideration of *those acts*, which are peculiarly annexed to the KINGLY office. Because, as we shall find them respectively ascrib'd to OUR LORD ; so, we shall from

† Heb. vii. 22.

thence

thence acquire farther assurance, that he is *a man*, and *no other* : I mean, neither angel, nor archangel. Here then we observe

(1.) IN the first place, his sending down THE HOLY GHOST to preside among us, as his substitute or vicegerent, on his ascension to heaven.

THAT THE HOLY GHOST descends from CHRIST, by virtue of his KINGLY office, is evident from this consideration : namely, that he is sent by OUR LORD in consequence of his triumphant ascension and glorious session at THE FATHER'S right hand ; as *a largess*, distributed by him on these grand occasions, to the subjects of his spiritual kingdom. To this purpose are those words by the apostle : *Wherefore — when he [CHRIST] ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men* : confirm'd in the strongest and most apposite terms by St. Peter in the account he gives us of the extraordinary effusion of THE SPIRIT on the day of Pentecost : *Therefore [JESUS] being by the right hand of GOD exalted, and having received of THE FATHER the promise of THE HOLY GHOST ; HE hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear* ².

THAT he is designed by his mission to *act* for OUR SAVIOUR, and in *subserviency* to his general interest, is likewise clear : not only from his being call'd THE SPIRIT of CHRIST, and therefore at his disposal ; but also, from his *work* at large ; as exhibited by CHRIST

¹ Eph. iv. 8.

² Acts ii. 33.

himself in his discourse with the apostles, a little before his crucifixion [as we find it in the 14, 15, and 16th chapters of the gospel by St. *John*:] with which the contents of the whole new testament, where it treats on this subject, every where agree. His grand business is to glorify CHRIST by taking of his things, and shewing them to his followers. So that, as CHRIST is now exalted with God's right hand, to be A PRINCE and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins¹; so, THE blessed SPIRIT will not fail to exalt him in those characters, among the rest, in the heart of every true christian. And then, in the last place,

THAT OUR LORD's sending down THE HOLY GHOST, is a substantial proof of his humanity, will appear from the two following considerations: namely,

I.] THAT it strictly belongs to him in quality of his being MEDIATOR.—The mission of THE blessed SPIRIT, for *super-natural purposes*, can never be supposed any part of the religion of nature; or, in other words, be considered as an act of divine sovereignty, resulting from GOD's absolute, natural dominion. Because, as it is apparently an establishment, set on foot for the recovery of mankind from their present degenerate circumstances; and is therefore, in great measure, calculated to advance the honour of CHRIST, as the person undertaking this extraordinary service: so, it must of necessity

¹ Acts v. 31.

be consider'd as a privilege peculiarly annext to *his constitutional*, that is, *his mediatorial character*.——To this reasoning, however, we have to subjoin express testimony from the mouth of CHRIST himself. As where he tells us, more at large, that *all power in heaven and in earth is given unto him*¹. For if *all power* be CHRIST's, in spirituals, as well as temporals; then, doubtless, *this*, by which THE HOLY GHOST is minister'd: as it is evidently fundamental to the support and enlargement of his *mediatorial* kingdom. But, he is yet more particular on this head, in his discourse with the apostles, refer'd to above; bespeaking them in these words: *Nevertheless, I tell you the truth; it is expedient for you, that I go away: for, if I go not away, THE COMFORTER will not come unto you; but, if I depart, I will send him unto you*². From whence it is clear to a demonstration, that the mission of THE HOLY GHOST depended absolutely on CHRIST's being publickly invested with the KINGLY office, on his ascension, as MEDIATOR.

HAVING then, both *the nature* of the thing, and *the authority* of CHRIST on our side, the argument is plainly this: that since the mission of THE blessed SPIRIT belongs to CHRIST, in consequence of his being MEDIATOR; it evidently proclaims him truly and properly *man*. The reason is: because humanity is absolutely inseparable from that character. For, we

¹ Matth. xxviii. 18.

² John xvi. 7.

have before proved, that as ours is *the middle nature* ; so, that it is the nature alone suited to the work of mediation. In perfect agreement with which principle, the text expressly declares: that *there is ONE GOD* [that is, one infinite, sovereign being, called GOD, in reference to his general, absolute character of dominion ;] *and ONE MEDIATOR between GOD and men*, the man CHRIST JESUS. — This then is the former consideration, proving from the present act the truth of OUR LORD'S humanity.

[2.] THE OTHER is: that for as much as it is certain, that the mission of THE HOLY GHOST, was absolutely *the promise* of THE FATHER to CHRIST, in consequence of his having first discharged all conditions stipulated for in *that covenant of peace*, which was between them BOTH *from everlasting* : we want no evidence to prove (it having been done, at large, in the course of these papers) that CHRIST could no otherwise be in circumstances proper to the discharge of these conditions, than as he possess'd the human nature in his own person ; and was, *as such*, actually made under that law, which bound the human species in general. — If then the human nature was the constitution alone suited to yield obedience to *the precept* of the law, on the one part ; and to suffer *the penalty* it inflicted for sin, on the other : and THE HOLY GHOST, in his mission, was positively suspended on OUR SAVIOUR'S submitting to those

¹ 1 Tim. ii. 5.

terms,

terms, or performing those conditions; and it now appear, not only that CHRIST has obey'd and suffer'd, but also received the gift of THE HOLY GHOST, and sent him down among us: does it not follow, from the reason of the thing, that as he hath both done *the work*, and received *the honour* peculiar to it; so, that he must be a person of that nature, which was alone suited to these services, and which therefore could alone go thro' with them; and, at last, make a just claim to the reward promised? But these things being true: What is the plain inference? Undoubtedly, that CHRIST is human, and not super-angelical.

(2.) THE next REGAL act, exercised by our LORD, giving us sufficient ground to conclude, that he is truly and properly man, is, that of his having establish'd *a body of laws*, for the government and well-being of us, his human, intelligent creatures.——If any inquire, *where* these laws are to be found; we refer them, more especially, to the contents of the new testament-revelation.——If it be ask'd, *How*, or *in what manner*, were they deliver'd? The answer is: partly, by CHRIST, in his sermons before his crucifixion, and in his discourse with the disciples, during his presence with them *for forty days* after his resurrection. [For, besides positive institutions, his instructions to the church, at large, may be consider'd as *so many commands* upon them.] And partly, by the apostles and pen-men of the new testament, his ministers for completing the canon of

scripture.—If the next demand be, *What is our evidence* from hence for the humanity of CHRIST? The return is, that it arises from the several following particulars: namely,

1.] THE GENERAL character, by which OUR LORD claims to himself a right, or prerogative of this nature; I mean, *to prescribe laws* to his creatures and subjects; which is no other than that of his being THE MEDIATOR, *the constituted head* over all persons and things, under THE FATHER: [for, as this is here a fundamental principle; so, is it, what we are always to keep in view.] But, if his claim to this *legislative* power be founded in his constitution [however, in part;] that constitution, we have already prov'd, is so far from giving the least countenance to his being a super-angelical nature; that it declares him, *ipso facto*, in the very reason of the thing, to be *that middle nature*, called *man*. Again,

2.] THIS truth is farther confirmed by OUR LORD's *ability* or *skill* for the great work now under consideration. For, as I am sure, there will be no appeal from the wisdom and propriety of OUR SAVIOUR's *laws*, by those, who are best acquainted with them; and who, for that reason, are truly qualified to judge concerning them: so, it will be confess'd, that they could only be fram'd by one, who had both a thorough insight into our constitution or nature, and a consummate knowledge of our circumstances; and therefore one, who knew how to allow for our weaknesses, as well as provide
for

for our wants. But where shall we look for a character of this kind? What! Beyond the verge of our own nature? among creatures, as of a different species; so, under a different government, from ourselves? No, surely. Reason itself tells us, that one, who was *in all points* [which could never be true of CHRIST, if his very essence were super-angelical; that one, who was *in all points*] made as we are, only *without sin*, must be the person *alone suited* to the present great work: namely, that of *giving laws* to the human species. But this CHRIST has done. And, as they bear the strongest marks of his wisdom on the one part, and of his sympathy, on the other; we conclude, that he is human, and not super-angelical. But then,

3.] LASTLY, we have the pleasure of observing, that OUR LORD is not only *our great lawgiver*, but also *our ensample*: that, to the extent of those laws, which affect the body of our species, he has not only *enacted*, but also *practised*: that he is himself *the great pattern* of what he enjoins. But, upon what conclusion does this naturally throw us? considering the whole of this, at the same time, as a general reinforcement, or exemplification, of the laws originally appropriate to the human nature, at large. Certainly that he, who could obey, as we do; must needs be a man, as we are. If he conform to our law, and this from a sense of obligation (which OUR LORD himself declares to be the case: *thus* it becometh us to

fulfil all righteousness :;) the reason could only be, that *he was made under that law* : which means, that it was strictly intitled to his obedience. But that being apparently matter of fact, it follows in the nature of the thing (as has been elsewhere observed :) that the subject of human laws can be no other, than an human intelligence. But to proceed,

(3.) THE APPOINTING *proper officers* in this, his spiritual kingdom, both to propagate the knowledge of his laws, and to see them carried into execution; is another branch of CHRIST'S REGAL POWER, in the discharge of which we shall find the traces of his humanity continued with equal clearness.

WHO these ministers are (so far, however, as the present purpose requires;) to what special ends they are appointed, and that they descend from CHRIST, as KING in *Sion*; will appear by a farther inspection of St. Paul's 4th chapter to the *Ephesians*, quoted above on this subject. For we find by accounts there given us, not only that OUR LORD, when he ascended up on high, *received gifts* for men in general; but also that he ordain'd particular officers: some of a superior order, such as *apostles, prophets, and evangelists*; and likewise *pastors and teachers*, as ministers of a lower rank.——And this with a design no less gracious than that, by this diversity of gifts, he *might perfect the saints*, provide for *the work of the ministry*, and edify

† Matth. iii. 15.

his body, the church ¹.—The evidence then, which this gives us in favour of OUR LORD's humanity, is the one thing now wanting; and this we may draw from the following particulars: namely,

1.] THAT the present prerogative, in agreement with the several other annexed to the REGAL office, is strictly *an appendage* of the *mediatorial* character: which *mediatorial* character, as we have before proved, bespeaks HIM, beyond contradiction, a true branch of the human nature. Again,

2.] WE observe farther, that this REGAL act appears to be an honour rising to CHRIST out of *his obedience and sufferings*. He is *made LORD and lawgiver* ² [or, has a name given him, *which is above every name* ³:] and he has therefore a right to appoint his several officers, because *he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross* ³: or, in other words, because he has perform'd *all covenant-conditions*. A service, as we have likewise shewed, peculiar to him, *as man*. And then,

3.] OUR LORD's appointment of *these officers* leads us to infer his humanity, because the institution itself [or, at least, every qualification necessary to it's support] appears to be included in his mission of THE HOLY GHOST.—THE HOLY GHOST therefore, in this case, may be consider'd as CHRIST's *prime minister*. And

¹ Ver. 8—12.
8, 9.

² Acts ii. 36.

³ Phil. ii.

most certainly true it is, that THE blessed SPIRIT, is the fountain of all ministerial gifts, as well as of all divine grace. But we have before prov'd, that THIS HOLY GHOST is sent by CHRIST, *as man* and MEDIATOR. The consequence of which is : that THAT, which is true of the whole, cannot but be true of the parts. If THE SPIRIT himself, who is the head in these services ; the root of all divine influence ; descend from CHRIST, as he is a branch of our nature, charged with the *mediatorial* functions : it then follows, of course, that all other ministers in the church, whether extraordinary or ordinary, being only so many members of himself, or inferior instruments in his hands ; are likewise given by CHRIST, in the same quality, or upon the same principle.—We might, indeed, subjoin to what has been now offer'd,

4.] In the last place, as matter of pertinent inquiry ; and therefore, as giving collateral strength to the argument before us : how *intirely unsuitable* to the present work must a super-angelical intelligence have been ? Because, not wearing our nature, he must, certainly, have been greatly at a loss to adapt means to our support. Who can judge either of the properest instruments to be employ'd for the service of the human species, or of the qualifications necessary for those instruments, under our various complicated wants ; but one, who, being himself *a man*, has suffer'd as we do (though *without sin*;) and therefore knows how,

on both accounts, to provide for us to the best advantage? And thus should we go on

(4.) To another REGAL act administer'd by CHRIST, to wit, that of his having *the present superintendency* of all persons and things; or, of his holding *the reins of providence*, universally, in his own hands: the argument, in the main, would still be *the same*; *the reasoning* proceed on the same principle.

THAT *the government*, including spiritual as well as temporal disposals, is on CHRIST'S *shoulders*¹; or, that *he is given to be the head* over all things to *the church*²; has been already observ'd once and again.—This then proves, that OUR LORD is MEDIATOR; and that, at once, involves his humanity. And, were it not so, from whence could we possibly derive his qualifications for this important charge? For who, but one of our own nature, could either sympathize with us under our afflictions; or enter into proper measures for our support and deliverance? Who, but one that has suffer'd from the same common enemies, could effectually provide against their different mischievous designs? And in such manner, dispose the hearts of men on the one part, and regulate every providence on the other; that the general issue of things should always turn to the advantage of his followers? OUR blessed SAVIOUR is known to manage for the church, both with the world and with *satan*; restraining the enmity of the one, and quelling the out-

¹ Isa. ix. 6.

² Eph. i. 22.

rage of the other. He is, moreover, found, even in the life present, more or less, to punish the wicked, and reward the righteous; thereby giving visible weight and strength to his government. Nay, he is ever attendant on his people, either by HIS SPIRIT for gracious purposes, or by his angels in temporal matters: always interposing, always over-ruling, thro' his extensive dominion, for their well-being here, and their eternal felicity hereafter; having made it his business to conduct them through life, and receive their unbodied spirits in the article of death.—But from what spring this affection? from what cause this assiduity? Why all this pains with, all this expence for, the human species, the Christian part of it, especially; if they were not members of his own body [*flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone*;] as well as severally the subjects of his kingdom? Therefore the one [subjects of his kingdom] because previously the other [members of his body:] and therefore, again, CHRIST himself their KING, because of the same common nature, in BOTH it's parts, with these his subjects; the human being the nature alone suited to the present government.

BUT these are some of those REGAL acts, which OUR SAVIOUR either has already exercised, or, which he is now in the exercise of; by which, both his right to the character of UNIVERSAL KING, and his interest in true and proper humanity, are equally secured. To

* Eph. v. 30.

these,

these, however, we may subjoin one or two more, which are yet future. The former of which, making

(5.) THE FIFTH, in order, is, *His raising of the dead*; meaning, as well those, who are CHRIST's, instantly, *on his second coming*¹; as the whole body of the wicked, *a thousand years after*².

THAT *this* is a branch of CHRIST's mediatorial glory, is not without it's evidence from what has been already suggested above³. But, if more particular proof be exacted, we have it from OUR LORD's own lips, on record by St. Matthew; where he tells us, that he, *as the son of man*, on his second revelation from heaven, *would send forth his angels, with a great sound of a trumpet, and that they should gather together his elect, from one end of heaven to the other*⁴. To which, his words, as given us by another evangelist, may likewise be added: For as THE FATHER raiseth up the dead, and quickneth them: even so THE SON quickneth whom he will. And again: *Verily, verily, I say unto you, the hour is coming* [respecting some, whom he would shortly raise from the dead; herein refering as well to his own resurrection, as to that of others, whom he would raise with himself, on that occasion; understanding the words wholly in a literal sense: *the hour is coming*] and [as to a spiritual resurrection from sin] *now is* [in his and his apostle's ministry] *when the dead shall hear the*

¹ Cor. xv. 23.
Arg. IV.

² Rev. xx. 5.

⁴ Ch. xxiv. 30, 31.

³ Page 9.

voice of THE SON of GOD : and they, that hear, shall live. For which he assigns the following reason: *For as THE FATHER hath life in himself [originally and essentially] so, hath he [for these glorious operations] given to THE SON, [even as MEDIATOR] to have life in himself.* And afterwards, speaking of himself under the character of *the son of man*, he saith; *Marvel not at this : for the hour is coming, in the which all, that are in the graves, shall hear his voice, &c.* All which is farther explain'd and supported by St. Paul's representations on this subject. The words are these: *The LORD [CHRIST] himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God : and the dead in CHRIST shall rise first*¹. From hence then it is very evident, both that the work itself is CHRIST's, and also, that it belongs to him on the foot of his *mediatorial* capacity, or, *as the son of man*. From whence the old inference undeniable results : namely, that whatever is CHRIST's property, as MEDIATOR ; it directly and irrefragably proclaims him, a branch of humanity.

NOTHING, however, can be more full and peremptory, than the text itself, quoted and explain'd under a preceding particular: *For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead*².

NOT but, this also brings again into view, the connexion subsisting between CHRIST and Adam, in their public capacities ; or, as the

¹ John v. 21, 25, 26, 28.

² 1 Theff. iv. 16.

³ 1 Cor.

xv. 21.

two men comprehending within themselves, the whole human nature. So that, as *the first man*, in the matters of the present life, appears to have been *a living soul*; CHRIST, on the other hand, in the affairs of the resurrection, appears to be *a quickning spirit* ¹. The parallel, in respect of humanity, equally holds on both sides; it being certain, that *the second Adam* is as really a man, in the part he has to act in the resurrection [because his prerogative in this case, is evidently founded on his having fulfil'd all covenant conditions, *as man*;] as it is generally allow'd, that *the first Adam*, is to be consider'd in that precise quality, through the whole of his concerns with the human nature. But then,

(6.) THE OTHER, and *last* REGAL act, appertaining to CHRIST, as MEDIATOR, and which is yet to come; is, that of *the judgment*.—And to this, much need not be said; the information given us on this head by CHRIST himself, being abundantly full and explicit, in every part of the subject: I mean, whether we consider OUR LORD's personal qualifications for, or his acquir'd right to, this honourable service; the nature of the work itself, or the parties who are to be judged. The account, I refer to, is that, where OUR LORD tells us: that THE FATHER [that is, immediately and solely] *judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto THE SON* ². And least the general character, by which he

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 45.

² John v. 22.

here speaks of himself [THE SON] should be charged with ambiguity; as though it were uncertain, whether we were to consider him, in this place, or, in reference to the present act, as purely a divine essence; or whether our LORD does not here, at least, principally, speak of himself in his *constituted* or *mediatorial* character: he so fully explains himself on this head at the 27th verse, as to leave no possible room for suspicion. His words are these:

And [THE FATHER] hath given him authority to execute judgment, because he is the son of MAN.

Now, what is this less than saying? That THE FATHER hath therefore committed the administration of *all judgment*, present and future, universally to him: First, because he is THE ONE MEDIATOR *between GOD and men.* And, secondly, because, as this MEDIATOR, he hath punctually fulfill'd *all covenant-conditions.* And, of course, thirdly, because he appears on the two above accounts, both to possess the alone nature *sui*ted to this work, and to have merited this honour by his obedience and sufferings. Here then we see, as in the latter case [his *obedience* and *sufferings*] the legality of his claim; so, in the former [his *metaphysical* nature] the propriety of his appointment: and in both of them put together, we have certainly the fullest testimony, we can desire, to the truth of his humanity.

WE might, indeed, in reference to the nature of this transaction, observe: that it is absolutely necessary, that our judge be both *visi-*
ble

ble and *impartial*. These qualifications then are readily and clearly accounted for on the principle now before us. For, as CHRIST wears our flesh ; so, he is evidently capable of making a visible appearance. And, as his spirit is of the same kind with our own ; he is, again, capable of entering into the true frame of our minds, and penetrating the spring of our actions : in consequence of which [being superior to all corruption ;] he cannot but determine concerning us with the last righteousness and truth.——So that here, the argument is farther on our side. Since it appears, for the reasons above, that none, but a branch of our own nature, can be a proper and equal judge of human, intelligent creatures ; or (which is the same thing) that there ought to be a proportion of nature between the person, who judges ; and the parties, who are judged.

NOR is it any objection to this reasoning, that OUR blessed SAVIOUR is also to judge [the apostate] *angels*. Because it must be allowed, that this whole act, standing absolutely connected with his prerogative as MEDIATOR ; is undoubtedly founded in his personal constitution as a *middle nature* : which also may be one reason among others, why those of the human species, who are members of his body, are to be joined with their LORD in this awful process¹.

¹ 1 Cor. vi. 3.

BUT,

BUT, with humble submission, would it not be something irregular, to set-up an *extra-nature*, as I may call it; one, at least, who shares no common relation to the different orders of created beings, to be the judge of the universe; or, to bring it nearer home, of the human nature in particular? Where could be found the shadow of a reason for it, in *that fitness of things*, which is so much cried-out for in this day; and which, we may be sure, THE ALMIGHTY will always punctually observe? Especially too, when we reflect that, besides the want of this community of nature in all orders of intelligent Being, excepting the human; there no where appears, the delegation of *universal power*, to any but *this middle nature*, thro' the whole system of creatures. Yet, most certain it is, that such delegation is absolutely necessary to the constitution of that person, who is to be judge of all universally.

WHEREFORE, as it is evident, from what has been now said, that the angelical nature cannot sustain the *mediatorial* character; and, for that reason, can make no claim to the honour of *universal dominion*: so, is it from thence equally certain, that the angelical nature must, for those reasons, stand for ever excluded from bearing any part in *the future judgment*; as the last and highest act of REGAL AUTHORITY. Which, as has been already observ'd, is itself a good reason, why *the KINGLY office* can, at no rate, be lodged in the hands of any of the angels. It being demon-
strable,

strable, on the contrary, that they are all of them, even to the highest of the highest order, the subjects of CHRIST's dominion, and not principal administrators [or, co-adjutors either with GOD or CHRIST] in any part of it. Wherefore, as this act devolves, of necessity, to CHRIST, THE MEDIATOR; so, it follows, by undeniable consequence, that he is truly and properly *a man*.

HAVING then proved by a series of particulars here introduced, not only that CHRIST is truly possess'd of REGAL AUTHORITY in it's utmost extent; but also, that he sustains this distinguishing honour, as a branch of the human nature, cloath'd with the *mediatorial* character: I might now be very well allow'd, to dismiss this subject, without any farther consideration. But as this seems to be the only office (so far as I have been able to observe) out of the three, which your lordship is pleas'd, in *an open, or avowed manner*, to ascribe to OUR SAVIOUR; and as you appear to have been the rather inclin'd to indulge him a privilege of this sort, because (as I take it) you supposed it might afford a proper opportunity of infering *a similitude of nature* between OUR SAVIOUR and *the tutelar angels*: it may not be time altogether misapplied, if we pursue the argument, in this precise view of it, to some farther length; as it seems a favorite exhibition with your lordship. And this, as well to prove, on the one hand, that these *guardian* angels, be their prerogatives, as such, never so

M

exten-

extensive ; have no right to be consider'd in the capacity of *kings* among us, the human reasonable species: as also, to prove, on the other, that there is nothing in this view of the subject, that will countenance the left parallel between *the persons* and *jurisdiction* of angels, and *the metaphysical nature* and *regal authority* of OUR SAVIOUR.

WHEREFORE, as to the former part of what is here advanced, I mean, That these *tutelar* angels have not the left pretension to be consider'd as *kings*, either as we understand that word, in common ; or, as it belongs peculiarly to ourselves ; will appear,

I. FIRST of all, by *the negative* inseparable from the following questions. For I have to demand on this occasion : Do we hear, that any one of these angels, ever appeared visibly among us in the *regal* character ? Ever personally fill'd a throne upon earth ? Ever issued out his edicts under *his sign manual* ? Ever, visibly, put the sanctions of his laws in execution ; publickly rewarding the good, and punishing the wicked ?—These, certainly, are the necessary qualifications ; this the proper business or office of *a king*. But, if nothing of this kind was ever found with any of these *tutelar* angels ; what right have they to be consider'd as acting the *regal* part among us, the human species ?

If their ministry, in giving forth the law at mount *Sinai*, be urged as a specimen of this
fort ;

sort; it will be no difficult matter to prove, that *that* is an instance altogether impertinent: For, it was not the angels, *as principals*, that gave forth the law; but GOD, or CHRIST, with, and by the angels.

If it be farther pretended, that we have in the person of CHRIST [as the complement of all that *regal* power, which was lodg'd in the hands of these governing angels;] both *the king*, and *the qualifications*, which are here requir'd; the easy return is: That this is no other than beging the question; his super-angelical nature having never been prov'd: or rather, that it is an absolute proof on our side; because CHRIST, in the execution of this office, appears to have been an human, and not a super-angelical spirit. Once more,

II. LET it be farther inquir'd: Do we not find, notwithstanding our admitting these *angelical* Presidents; that there were ever persons of our own make, men, like ourselves, always filling the thrones of the different kingdoms of the earth? always prescribing their own laws, and governing in their own persons? Supposing then (and, I imagine, it will appear, that this is carrying the matter to an extremity) that any of them were absolutely *stated, guardian angels*; and that, as such, they were appointed to reside at this, or the other court; or, it may be, at all the respective courts of the universe: What are we to infer from this concession? Not, as far as I have yet been able to learn, that they ever usurp'd the

regal power in this, or the other state : not, that they appear'd in any one visible act of government, civil, or ecclesiastical. These, therefore, were still the inviolable property of one of our own nature ; personally seated on the throne, thro' the different kingdoms of the terraqueous globe. The conclusion then, I presume, is intirely in our favour. It cannot, however, fail of that Issue, when we have,

III. In the next place, acquainted ourselves more positively with the nature of their business in the capacity of *tutelar angels*. Because we shall find it of a very different kind from that commonly understood by the term *king* among us ; and therefore no way interfering with civil government as vested in the hands of this, or the other, sovereign prince. The inquiry then is : Upon what errands are they sent hither ? Or, in what offices are they respectively employ'd on our earth ? — Here, probability, or conjecture, in various particulars, must answer for us ; knowing little more, than that, in the general, they are *all ministering spirits*¹ ; sent forth on different Commissions, either by THE FATHER or CHRIST, as the exigency may require, in temporal and spiritual concerns. More particularly,

I. In the first place, we have reason to suppose, they have orders to attend the courts of secular princes, especially when councils of State are held, on various occasions. For instance, speaking here of *the good angels* only :

¹ Heb. i. 14.

they

they may be present to inspire princes and courtiers with those sentiments, which may be for the service of their different states and the kingdoms in alliance with them. Or, where judgments are designed to be executed upon them; they may be employ'd to confuse their counsels and precipitate their measures [or, which is the same thing in effect, may prevent them from following the maxims of true policy;] and by that means leave them to such irregular pursuits, as may bring a scourge upon them, if not terminate in their general destruction.—Or, *these good angels*, having their attachments (originally by commission from heaven) to this, or the other, particular state; may be allowed to inspire matter for political debate, and by a train of suggestions, support these debates in their respective courts; as a kind of partial opposition, in order to attest their peculiar concern for their different wards, and advance the true interest of their favourite provinces. Which oppositions they may be led into, thro' their ignorance of the divine counsels, purposely concealed from them, that things, to an eye of sense, may take, as it were, their natural turn only; but, in the issue, illustrate, in a more particular manner, the wisdom and providence of CHRIST, in over-ruling all events to the general happiness of his creatures, but that of his church more especially. Nor do oppositions of this kind among *the good angels*, as attending the interest of their master at the several courts of tempo-

ral princes, involve in them the least degree of animosity or resentment. Because, whatever argues imperfection, is to be charged to the corruption or obliquity of nature ; and is therefore, by no means, to be consider'd as part of it's original frame ; All coming pure out of the divine hands, and, doubtless, remaining so, where there has been no fatal revolution in the system.—But not to restrain the business of these *guardian* angels to the particulars above, as barely resident with princes at their different courts, we may farther observe,

2. THAT there is likewise reason to suppose, that they are employed more at large, in every office of benevolence and tenderness, that princes or subjects may appear to stand in need of in common : especially may we believe this to be the case with respect to the righteous of both those classes ; or, where either the establishment or progress of true religion is at stake. For, as there is the last reason to conclude, that the several angels of *the apostate kind*, have their part to act, and are ever vigilant to push their designs, not only to the injury of particular members ; but, so far as permitted, to the detriment of the Christian church in general : it is not for us to say, to what lengths they might proceed, in attacks on our bodies, as well as our substance, or rather, on our interest at large, natural and spiritual ; were not these invisible ministers, *the good angels*, at hand, to spread their wings around us, and, under their great LORD, ward
off

off every blow, that *our adversary, the devil*, as well in person, as by his instruments, might be hourly aiming to our ruin.

HAVING then, this prospect of the nature of that work, which we may reasonably suppose, *the good angels* employ'd in, for the service of individuals, as well as of kingdoms: What is there wanting to give it all the extent, necessary to secure to them their proper character as *tutelar* or *guardian angels*? Whether we consider them, as employ'd more *professedly* in this way, under the old testament; or, even in a period preceding our creation²: Or, whether (as may be possibly their present case) we behold them in a more *general* capacity, as acting *at large*; unless, where especial commissions may be given for particular services, under the new testament.

BUT, when part only, or even the whole of what has been last said, is admitted; where is there from hence, the left foundation to compliment them with the character of *kings*, in our sense of the word? Or, of supposing, from their business, at large; that we have proper warrant, to form a comparison, either as to *nature*, or *office*, between these *guardian angels* and OUR blessed SAVIOUR?—However, not to rest the argument intirely on the side of these *tutelar* angels; let us now see, on the contrary, how the case stands with respect to OUR SAVIOUR himself; as a farther means of

¹ 1 Pet. v. 8.

² See *Essay*, §. xxxix.

evincing the impropriety of such a parallel in the most distant view of it possible. And here I would observe,

I. FIRST of all, that, as to *the true nature*, possessing the REGAL authority, now under consideration ; it has been proved to be *the human*, in the person of CHRIST, and no other. This, by all the reasonings adduced in the above pages, supported by the authority of *scripture*, on the one hand, and the evidence of *facts*, on the other ; partly present, and partly in promise ; appears to be the indisputable matter of fact. And therefore, a question of this kind is to no purpose, unless it be that of betraying the ignorance of those, who put it : If the present prerogative, namely, REGAL DOMINION, be a character too rais'd for any of the angelical world, even *Michael* himself ; how will it be found compatible with one of an inferior order, that is to say, one of the human species ? Because I have above fully explained, in what manner, and by what right, both *natural* and *mediatorial*, our blessed SAVIOUR, though an human and not a super-angelical spirit, stands possess'd of this *sovereign* character. To which therefore I here beg leave to refer ¹. Not but I have likewise to subjoin on the part of CHRIST, in opposition to the present suppos'd correspondence between him and the governing angels.

¹ See above, p. 133, &c.

II. THAT

II. THAT *the respective jurisdictions* admit of no comparison. For, as to that of the angels, it is, at best, but *partial*; whereas, this of CHRIST is *universal*. If an angel preside, he has his particular district; his particular court; his peculiar people, or nation, assign'd him. But, what is this, to the power of one, whose kingdom is of universal extent? For, even all these angels, and all their states, supposing them never so numerous; are branches of CHRIST's empire. Nor so only: but they are absolutely *nothing* without him; *nothing* in comparison of him. *His throne is prepared in the heavens, and his kingdom ruleth over all*¹: [for GOD and CHRIST are always connected in all administrations:] *angels, and authorities and powers being made subject unto him*², and dependent upon him.

COULD it, indeed, be proved, that CHRIST never *created*, and, consequently, had never the power to *govern*, any, but the inhabitants of this earth; the argument might appear somewhat more feasible: but this is far from being the case, allowing the validity of scripture-revelation; from which, if we suffer any appeal in these matters, we must immediately sink into the last darkness and confusion. Once more,

¹ Ps. ciii. 19. compar'd with Heb. i. 8, and Eph. i. 22.

² 1 Pet. iii. 22.

III. THE

III. THE RULE of *proportion*, as under some preceding heads, may here again be very properly call'd in, as subversive of the present imaginary similitude between CHRIST and *governing angels*. For, with submission, what can there be so abhorrent in the nature of things, as to erect a government, where there is no conformity, except only in appearance, between *a people* and *their prince*? But where, on the contrary, the real disproportion or distance between them, shall be so wide, that the one shall be supposed of the super-angelical, and the other merely of the human species? Is not this to set *king* and *subject* at the utmost variance? And, consequently, make no due provision for a body of laws suited to our nature? For allowing, as we are obliged on the authority of holy scripture, that the angels are creatures, who excel in *wisdom*, as well as in *strength*; and that, both by their presiding at courts, and attending human nature in general, they cannot but have acquir'd such a degree of knowledge, by inspecting our affairs, and observing our particular complexions; as may be sufficient to direct them, as well concerning *the matter* of what it may be proper for them to suggest, as concerning *the manner*, in which they may most successfully interpose in our behalf: the whole of this allowed; who, nevertheless, cannot see, that the present is a very different view of things from that, which appears necessary to take place between *the prince*

prince and *his people*? For, where the nature is not common to both, it does not seem reasonable to suppose, that the laws of the one can be so equally contriv'd for the benefit of the other. Because the very principle, on which such laws ought to be built [meaning, affinity of nature and mutual feelings] is absolutely wanting. But this being the basis of government, that which makes it endearing as well as consistent; we can upon no reasoning be warranted to think, that a super-angelical spirit can be so thoroughly qualified to dictate for us, as one of our own nature and rank ¹. But then,

IV. LASTLY, To settle the present point by one common observation, including CHRIST and the angels; that is, *the principal* and *his ministers*; the whole of the argument before us seems to be this: That each order of angels, very probably, is *an hierarchy* of it's own; and, consequently, has *a head*, or *king*, within itself. I apprehend, we are certain of this, as to the *angelical* species, properly so call'd; because we are positively told, that there is such a person as *the archangel*; which, I presume, is the same as saying *the chief* or *prince* of that order: and, by parity of reason (as was suggested in another place ²) the several other orders may, likewise, be supposed to have *their head* or *chief*. In which case again *the analogy* or *pro-*

¹ See above, *Regal Aq.* (2) p. 163.
p. 87.

² Above,
portion,

portion, on which I have all along reason'd, must apparently hold; and therefore afford a good presumptive proof on our side: That THE ALMIGHTY, in a consistency with himself, has certainly observ'd the same rule with respect to the government of us, the human reasonable species. The consequence of which is, that no other personage whatsoever, can be qualified, in his own private nature, to bear the KINGLY power among us; but one, who is himself of the same rank or species with ourselves. While, on the other hand, the whole interest of every superior order of created beings in, or the amount of their concern with, us, the human species; will, probably, be found to terminate here [referring now to *the good angels only*:] that they are neither more, nor less, as was observ'd above, than so many *ministring spirits*, or guardian powers, *sent forth by CHRIST, to minister to them who shall be heirs of salvation*¹; which is directing us to consider them as *the ministers*, but not as *the directors* of divine Providence. Which means, in other words, as *servants* to us, but not as *kings* over us: that being the sole prerogative of CHRIST, under THE FATHER. And if it be *otherwise*, with regard to the several orders, superior to *the angelical*; such, for example, as those called *thrones, dominions, principalities, &c.* I cannot see, what we have to conclude from it, unless it be, that they have no office, either of *power* or *service* among us; but stand

¹ Heb. i. 14.

charged with business peculiar to their own system; yet this wholly under CHRIST, as MEDIATOR.

AND thus, from the several arguments offer'd above, your lordship will please to observe, what a variety of *positive evidence* there is against that part of *The Essay*, which supposes OUR SAVIOUR a super-angelical essence, particularly, the archangel *Michael*.—And tho' it has so happen'd, in the prosecution of this subject, that I have departed, in more places than one, from *the modish divinity* of the age; and, therefore, have occasionally introduc'd such doctrines, as those of *the public headship* of CHRIST; the establishment of an eternal compact, called *the covenant of grace*, between THE FATHER and SON; the introduction of *moral evil* on *the disobedience* of our first parents; *the substitution* of CHRIST in *the law-place* of human, lapsed creatures, for the great purposes of *atonement* and *righteousness*, with *the rest*: I would, however, flatter myself, that I am not, in these points, wholly unintelligible to your lordship; nor so very unhappy, as to have *these mediums* intirely disputed on the present argument. For this I cannot help saying in their favour, that, with me, the above doctrines are the grand, leading principles of that religion, which we boast to have received from heaven by OUR BIBLE; and that, consequently, to give them up, would be, in my humble opinion, to resign all *scriptural* evidence; and, of course, at the same time, sacrifice

crifice every thing, that is *distinguishing* in Christianity.

TRUE, this has been done of late years: this is certainly, the prevailing taste of our great *modern* divines. But, will your lordship pardon me, when I inquire: What has been the consequence of this fatal surrender? Has not this in fact, been *the flood-gates*, through which error, in it's various streams, has broke-in so terribly upon us?—Give-up those doctrinal truths, which are the absolute criterion, or, rather, the alone basis of christianity; and, by that means, sink *the religion of JESUS*, to a level with *the religion of nature*: And how is there room to wonder, that *deism* should enter the lists, and dispute *the palm* with OUR SAVIOUR? For, if the religion of CHRIST has nothing *distinguishing* in it [and that it cannot have, unless the articles above make part of *that glorious distinction*:] if the new-testament revelation be charged with no peculiar instructions, bespeaking the necessity of *the mediatorial constitution*, to our present and eternal welfare; then, the unavoidable conclusion must be: That christianity is no more than *a republication* of the law of *nature*; or, at best, but a set of moral truths with a little brighter evidence, and some few stronger inforcements to virtue, than what we were before supplied with from the doctrine of the ancient, heathen philosophers. From whence there is only this one inference left: namely, that then *nature* still, and not CHRIST, is OUR SAVIOUR. A principle,

principle, which cannot but be big with terror to every true, pious christian.

HOWEVER, as I dare not suffer myself to suspect, that I shall fall under any prejudice with your lordship from this quarter (for it may, surely, be presumed, that you have not *thus learnt* CHRIST :) So, I cannot but indulge myself the pleasing hopes, that your lordship, on the most deliberate examination, will not only allow the aforesaid doctrines that weight in the present argument, which they certainly share in the grand oeconomy of salvation ; but also that, on the other heads of reasoning (for they are not all of the above kind) you will, probably, find so much suggested in proof of OUR SAVIOUR'S *true humanity*, as may give your lordship occasion for farther reflection on that important subject.—This, indeed, might have been of considerable advantage : That had I been master of your lordship's whole system of divinity, matters, then, might have been argued more fully, and, probably, with more satisfaction on your own principles. But time only can put that in our power ; supposing you may condescend in some future period of life, to lay aside your present *metaphysical garb* ; and appear in your native dress as a protestant, christian divine.

BUT to return : having made this progress, as was said above, in exhibiting the numerous *positive evidence*, which we meet with both

¹ See *The Essay*, Dedication, p. li.

from *reason* and *scripture*, in support of our LORD's *proper humanity*: what I have next to subjoin, will be a single remark on the contrary side of the question; leading me to point out *the slender foundation*, on which this part of your lordship's *hypothesis* seems to be built.

You will not therefore be surpris'd, when I observe, that what is here advanc'd concerning *the metaphysical nature* of CHRIST as *angelical* or *super-angelical* [unless the doctrine of governing angels, which I have been just speaking to above, has any share in it likewise; this principle, I am inclin'd to think] is originally borrow'd from those scriptural histories, which tell us, of *certain angels* appearing of old under the similitude of *men*, and of their being called by *that name*. It is chiefly in consequence of these representations, or I am greatly mistaken, that persons have argued, in the matter before us, directly to this effect: namely, "That because it is certain, *angels* did appear once and again, in the form or similitude of *men*, and were also call'd, *men*, under the former dispensation; therefore CHRIST too, either appearing amongst *those angels*, or, occasionally by himself, in the like form with them; is to be consider'd as a being of the *same metaphysical* nature, and not as an *human* intelligence in the strict sense of the word. Or, more briefly thus: *Angels*, in holy scripture, are called *men*; and therefore CHRIST, though term'd *a man*, must

" be

" an
sonin

H
cond
work
myse
passa
with
refer
tory
into
tend
the
in v
viou
pos
nera
cha
fis,
prin
ma
teri
of
fue
cer
off

ask
sup

"*an angel.*"—As to the force of this reasoning, it will be inquir'd into presently.

HERE then, I am at once brought to *the second grand division* of the former part of my work: Namely, that, by which I at first charged myself with a particular examination of *such passages of scripture*, as bring us acquainted with *appearances* of this kind.—Now, in reference to these several passages of sacred history, and the method in which I shall call them into view; I shall oblige myself to a close attendance on your lordship; neither lessening the series of texts, nor inverting the order, in which they present from *The Essay*. Previous, however, to the inspection here propos'd, your lordship will indulge me a few general observations; partly, in defense of the charge last brought against the present hypothesis, I mean, that *it's basis is really weak*; but, principally, as throwing us *on such mediums*, as may be necessary to prepare our minds, for entering with greater accuracy on the examination of these several texts; and, therefore, in the issue, enable us to form a true judgment concerning their genuine contents. Shall I then offend, if

I. In the first place, I take the liberty of asking? Whether, or no, can it be reasonably supposed, that accounts of this kind (which

N

are

are to be considered as *figurative*, rather than *literal*;) contain any thing in them capable of giving support to the conclusion here drawn from them? For, is it not plain, that these descriptions are intirely raised on *the outward, visible appearance*, made by these Persons; and not from any, though it were a distant, reference to *their abstract nature*, or *metaphysical composition*? And again, to strengthen this reasoning, is there any thing more common, either in nature, or revelation, than characters of this kind? where things are said *to be* this, or the other, merely because they wear such an external aspect, or appear in that precise form to the natural eye? What other proofs of this sort need we, than the scriptural representations of our great luminary, the sun?

THUS therefore, in reference to the matter now in debate. We find, that the persons concerned in these appearances under the old-testament dispensation, are particularly described, if single, by the name of *a man*; if more, by the character of *men*. And what is the objection to this use of the terms? Since, it is very evident, that in cases of this nature, nothing more is required to justify the conduct of the historian, than that: Whether more, or fewer, persons were seen, they absolutely made this appearance to the natural or bodily eye; be their private, metaphysical nature *human*, or *angelical*: for as much as the term is indifferently used for intelligent agents of each species.— And as we lie under this difficulty, where the
term

term *man* is made use of; so are we to observe,

II. THAT the case is exactly the same in reference to the other character, *viz.* that of *angel*; which is found to occur more frequently on these occasions. For neither here can any thing determinate be drawn from *the bare character*, in regard to the true metaphysical nature of the person, or persons, to whom it is applied. For which these two reasons are to be given, namely,

I. THAT the term *angel* is properly a name of *office*, and not of *nature*: therefore, by no means expressing the constitutional frame of the person, [at least, *separately*, or *exclusive of office*;] but only, or primarily, the capacity in which he acts. And therefore, as the next order of intelligent beings above us, are *all ministering spirits*; it is reasonable to suppose, they are called *angels*, with a principal, if not an intire, reference to *the service*, in which they are retained. Again,

2. BECAUSE, in consequence of what has been now observ'd, it is well known, that the term, *angel*, is used with no small latitude: not only by *the Jews* in their common dialect, or, *secundum communem consuetudinem*, as *Buxtorf* speaks¹; but also in the holy scriptures, as they condescend, in various instances, to speak the familiar language of *The Jews*. Thus, for example, it is applied to THE DIVINE BE-

¹ Arc. Foed. p. 134.

ING himself: not only because THE ALMIGHTY is frequently pleased to make use of *the angels* as his ministers; but also, because HE himself is truly present with them, on these occasions. Nay, let me yet add farther: because HE has vouchsafed, in a variety of instances (as we shall see more fully hereafter) to take upon himself, in, or with THE MEDIATOR, the office and ministry of *an angel*.

AGAIN: It is more commonly applied to, or understood of, THE SON of GOD, the person called THE MESSIAH. Because he likewise, in consequence of his *mediatorial* charge, has either been frequently pleased to take upon him the service and ministry of *an angel*, or has not scrupled appearing, on various occasions, in that quality: Or, rather, because he is, emphatically, *the angel of the covenant* ¹, and *the angel of the divine presence* ²; which is as much as to say: JEHOVAH's *peculiar messenger*.

IT is farther observable, that this term is likewise applied to *the prophets* under the old testament ³, and to *christian bishops*, or *ministers*, under the new ⁴. And also to those, who are employed by GOD as *instruments* for executing his judgments ⁵. Again, this term is given to the apostate spirits, called *devils*: ⁶ And, lastly, to those intellectual agents, who are termed *angels*, in the more strict and common

¹ Mal. iii. 1.
Hagg. i. 13.
7, and xv. 7, 8.

² Isa. lxiii. 9.
⁴ Rev. ii. 1, 8, &c.
⁶ 1 Cor. vi. 3.

³ Judg. ii. 1.
⁵ Rev. xii.

sense of the word ; as being the ordinary instruments or messengers of heaven ¹.

FOR as much then, as it is clear to a demonstration, that both these characters are used with more, or less compass ; and, as it were, interchangeably, between *men* and *angels*, in the literal use of that term ; the true state of the case, as it rises on the amount of this and the preceding head, seems to be as here follows : namely, that were we allowed to conclude from descriptions of this sort, taken wholly from the external appearance of objects, or from a less strict and figurative application of names ; we might as well say, on the one hand, that those very persons, who appeared to *Abraham* and *Lot*, and are known on *St. Paul's* testimony to have been *real angels* (two of them, at least ;) were, however, no such beings, but, on the contrary, creatures of our own nature : and, again, on the other hand, that those several *officers* and *instruments*, refer'd to above, whom we know, by incontestible proofs, to have been *real men*, and no more ; were, nevertheless, truly and properly *angels* : I say, we might then very well give into these different, and contradictory conclusions ; and this, on one and the same principle : meaning, that these persons are indifferently called by both names [*men* and *angels*.] And again, in regard to those of our own spe-

¹ Mark xiii. 23. Heb. i. 13, 14. For other acceptations of this word [*angel*] see Dr. *Benson's* Paraphrase, &c. on 1 Tim. iii. 16, Note 1.

cies, it is likewise to be observed, not only that they fully answer to the general character of *messengers*; but also, that they are found to wear *no other appearance*, than what the *angels* themselves have assumed on certain occasions.

So that it is from hence easy to see, that the argument is plainly *equivocal*; being of the same force [if we consider it abstractly, or in itself] on the one side of the question, that it is on the other. From whence it follows, that we can no otherwise determine concerning the nature of the persons making those appearances, than as particular circumstances, in the series of *the narrative*, prove them to be either *true men*, or *real angels*.—And this, likewise, must be the case, even supposing we should find (as, I imagine, we shall) that THE DIVINE and MEDIATORIAL BEINGS were actually concern'd in appearances of this kind. Once more,

III. PERMIT me to remark, that notwithstanding your lordship is pleased to introduce *the antient Jews*, as favouring your sentiments, both in respect to *the metaphysical nature* of the person, who is supposed principally concern'd in these appearances; and also, in reference to *the individual angel*, you have here fixed upon, namely, *Michael*: yet, if we may depend on the judgment and veracity of Dr. *Allix* and *Buxtorf*, it is notorious, either,

I. THAT not only *the most antient Jews* before CHRIST's incarnation, but also, *the great Jewish*

Jewish *synagogue*, immediately after CHRIST'S time; were intire strangers to this doctrine in both it's branches: and therefore, on the contrary, asserted, that *the angel* making these appearances under the old testament, was no other than the person, call'd THE SON of GOD; THE MEMRA, or WORD; THE WISDOM of GOD; THE ANGEL of THE LORD, &c. By all which characters, they were so far from understanding any thing like a created being; that, if we consult *The Targum*, or *Chaldee Glosses* (which are the oldest *Jewish* writings now extant) we shall find: that *The Jews* were then of opinion, that THIS MEMRA was no less person than THE ALMIGHTY himself¹.) In support of which sentiment, it is also very well known, that THIS ANGEL likewise bears the names of ADONAI, ELOHIM, and even the incommunicable name itself, that is, JEHOVAH. The plain consequence of which must be, that neither the holy scriptures themselves, nor the most antient *Jewish* writers, ever designed to exhibit *a mere creature* by these distinguished titles. I observe then, that either this is the real matter of fact in the present inquiry; or else,

2. THAT, where any of *The antient Jews* did not care to come so fully into the above interpretation; but, on the contrary, scrupled to apply the several appearances now under consideration, either to THE ALMIGHTY GOD, or to HIS MEMRA, expressly, and by name:

¹ See *Calmet* in VOC. MEMRA.

they, however, could not but perceive certain particulars, of so very sublime and glorious a nature, in these different accounts ; that, either not knowing their true application, or not choosing to be open in their professions ; the discoveries they made, whether more or less clear, had the same untoward influence upon them, which they have had since on their brethren, *The modern Jews* : what I intend, is, that they did not a little embarrass their inquiries, and confuse their opinions. So that being greatly puzzled in their researches on this head, particularly *The modern Jews*, we find hardly any two of them agree in their sentiments, either as to *the nature*, or *name*, of the person, more especially concern'd in the question before us. For, with one, he is the archangel *Michael* ; with another, the angel *Gabriel*. A third calls him by the name *Metatron* ; never telling us, however, who this *Metatron* may be. While a fourth describes him under the character of *the redeeming angel*, in allusion to *Jacob's* representations on the subject, *Genesis*, ch. xlviii. 16.

BUT, what is principally to our purpose in the whole of this, is : that, notwithstanding the present variety of opinion, they all of them agree to speak of this person by *such names* ; to allow him a right to *such honours*, and to ascribe to him *such operations*, both *natural* and *spiritual* ; as are absolutely incompatible with the character of any *mere creature* whatever. But I go on,

IV. BESIDES

IV. BESIDES the most considerable writers among *The Jews*, your lordship takes occasion to mention *The Fathers*; particularly those of "the first three hundred years after CHRIST, as universally agreeing in the afore-mentioned Doctrine" of *The Essay* ¹. But, with submission, what is that particular doctrine here especially refer'd to? The answer is: That *these fathers* contended for a *subordination* of the persons in *The Trinity*, or denied the doctrine of *three co-equal persons* in THE DIVINE UNITY. But this, my lord, I cannot but apprehend, is, in great measure, diverting the reader from the main point in view; or is, at best, a mistating of it in one of it's grand branches: I mean that, now more directly under consideration. Because we are here, not so much concern'd with the precise doctrine of *three co-equal persons* in the DIVINE essence; as we are with the true, *metaphysical* nature of THE SON; for instance, whether he be the archangel *Michael*; that is, in other terms: whether he be *a mere creature*, or not.—Which, again, is equally the case, on the other grand branch of the controversy: namely, what concerns the *metaphysical* nature of THE HOLY GHOST; particularly, not whether he is a being *subordinate* to THE FATHER, but whether he be *truly* and *properly* DIVINE.

YOUR LORDSHIP therefore, it must be observed, cites *these ancient fathers*, not to prove,

¹ See §. cxvi.

that

that they disbelieved THE DIVINITY of THE SON [for with that, *his subordination*, as MEDIATOR, is, surely, very consistent. And I dare also submit it to consideration, whether we may not here venture a step farther, without the least injury to our subject; and therefore admit his *subordination* to, and *dependence* upon, THE FATHER, even as THE SON, in the highest sense of the word. What leads me to suspect something of this kind is, that as the person, called THE FATHER, is confessedly *unoriginate*; so, on the contrary, the person called THE SON, is, in general, acknowledg'd to be *deriv'd*: a matter, I suppose, inseparable from the word SON, as one *generated* or *begotten*. But this allow'd, there is still DIVINITY, true and proper DIVINITY, belonging to THIS SON. For, unless that also be granted, it is certain, he can no longer be properly A SON, in the one, peculiar sense, in which that character is attributed to CHRIST. Because that term, besides the idea of *derivation*; likewise absolutely implies *a similitude* or *community of nature* with THE FATHER. For, who sees not, that he must be *a strange son*, that is, unworthy the character; who does not truly partake of the same nature with *his father*? But to return: your lordship, therefore, I observe, quotes these early writers in the Christian church, not to prove that their sentiments infringed on THE true DIVINITY of THE SON;] or, which is the same thing, not to demonstrate to us, that they looked upon
THE

THE SON of GOD, to be nothing more than a mere creature, or bare *super-angelical* nature: And yet, can there be any thing more obvious, than that, unless your lordship could have produc'd the testimony of *these fathers* on this side of the question; their names can be of no possible weight in the present controversy? Since it is in this light, and this only, that they can be of service to your lordship's hypothesis.

AND much to the same purpose, on this part of the argument, is *The Trinity of The Pagans*; which your lordship hath taken the pains to draw out from section cxix to section cxxxii, inclusive. Only, that we may be positive that, if we cannot inform ourselves in the true, *metaphysical* nature of THE SON; neither from the *Hebrew* commentators, nor *the primitive Christian fathers*; it will be in vain to expect satisfaction in this particular, from the *Gentile* sages.

BUT, as to *these* antient Christian fathers, that I may resume that part of the subject; your lordship, it seems, will very cordially give them all up. And wherefore? Not only, as you intimate, because they afford proof enough of their having been *fallible men*; but, I suspect, farther, because you are sensible, that the case here, taken in it's whole compass, is the same with that, under the preceding head. What I mean is: that your lordship sees, there are fathers against fathers, as well as rabbins against rabbins; and let me

add, *philosophers* against *philosophers*. — For myself, I presume at nothing affirmative in the case ; having neither books, nor leisure, to examine the absolute matter of fact. But that there are QUOTATIONS in abundance from these venerable writers on *the opposite parts* of the argument ; whoever looks into Dr. *Clarke's* writings, on the one side, and Dr. *Waterland's* on the other ; will, I suppose, be obliged to acknowledge. Not but Dr. *Whitby*, singly, will furnish with instances enough of *both kinds* ; if we take the trouble of comparing, what he calls *his last thoughts*, with *his annotations* on the new testament.

WHAT then is the one thing farther, which concerns the body of Christians in this point ? We here see ourselves bewilder'd amidst a strange variety of opinions ; left to search out our way through surrounding darkness and obscurity ; encompass'd, it seems, with men, who, though among the best and wisest of their species, and living, some of them, nearest the ministry of CHRIST and his apostles, were, nevertheless, *liable to mistakes* ; and, what is yet more, who, either on the one part or the other, were *actually mistaken* : [Because of two contrary propositions, one of them cannot but be false.] What then, as I said above, is the general conclusion from hence ? the use that Christians, in common, are to make of the premises ? Undoubtedly, that we be very cautious in the admission of *human testimony* ; and that we bring every religious opinion to the

the scale of sacred revelation : observing, likewise, that as these scriptures are both the source and standard of all divine truth ; so (let men differ as they please) these, however, are always consistent with themselves ; and, at the same time, afford the best helps for unfolding their own genuine contents. But to advance in the argument, and draw yet nearer to the point in hand ; I observe,

V. IN the next place, That, as no doubt can be made, respecting the reality of *angelical appearances* under the old-testament period (especially, supposing the angels to have had so remarkable a share in *the administration* of affairs on this terraqueous globe ;) so, neither will it be thought in the least degree strange, should we suppose, that OUR blessed SAVIOUR likewise [prov'd above, to be a branch of the human nature] did not disdain to make *occasional visits* to some considerable persons of the church under that dispensation ; either *alone*, or *in company* with one or more of *the angels*, as his retinue.

WE very well know, what his work and office was, as MEDIATOR ; what was to be the principal seat of his ministry and sufferings ; and also, who the favourite intelligent beings were, for whom he thus undertook. He himself has told us, under the character of WISDOM, not only as expressing the pleasure he took in *the foreviews* of his incarnation ; but, I am ready to think, as a description of
personal

personal visits: That *he rejoic'd in the habitable parts of God's earth*, and that *his delights were with the sons of men*¹. No wonder, therefore, if we find him, once and again, descending upon our earth, as *an exhibition*, necessary to assert his character as **HEAD** of the church; and afford his servants, of those early ages of the world, proper assurance of his future incarnation. What then is the natural conclusion from hence? Without doubt, that we may expect to find him, bearing part, at least, in those several appearances, which make *the greatest figure* in the books of the old testament: It being reasonable to suppose, that as he had the most important affairs to transact; so, that it was necessary, he should be frequently on the spot. Nor is an observation of this kind, adapted only to the circumstances of **CHRIST**, as **MEDIATOR**; but, indeed, to those of **THE DIVINE BEING** also; and therefore, I may be allowed to subjoin,

VI. THAT, since **THE DIVINE MAJESTY** is the fountain of being; since universal nature was, and is his; that since there can never be a moment, in which he has not a sensible regard to his creatures, his church especially; in fine, since he is so far incapable of exclusion, that he cannot but be intimately, and substantially present in all places, and with all persons: What is there to hinder, but that we likewise take the presence of **THE DIVINE**

¹ Prov. viii. 31.

BEING along with us, through these several illustrious accounts? Nay, certain it is, that he cannot be precluded from any one of these appearances. For, if he *fill all in all* [not excepting CHRIST himself] what is the place devoid of his presence? If *an hair of our head* fall not to the ground *without his permission* (which is implied in there being *all number'd*;) what are the concerns of this world, especially the intelligent and Christian part of it, which are beneath his observance?

IF *action* be the glory of *the man*, how much more of THE DIVINE NATURE? How greatly then, do those injure the divine glory, who place THE ALMIGHTY at a kind of haughty, fullen distance from his creatures? and exhibit him, truly, as one *too highly exalted* to enjoy any thing, but a state of majestic indolence? A description like this, may suit the fabulous deity of the heathen poet [*Non licet exiguis rebus adesse* Jovi:] But far, very far, be the insinuation from him, who is *essentially* present in, and therefore *equally* diffus'd through all space. And who, again, for the very same reason, lives, and cannot but live, through all his works; animating, directing and superintending the whole by his universal presence and peculiar divine influence.

NOR does it, in the least, infringe on this doctrine, that ALMIGHTY GOD may work in the general, or for the most part, *by instruments*. For, whether he operate *immediately*

! Matth. x. 30.

[though

[though, as he does every thing BY CHRIST, I question the propriety of that term, in it's *strict acceptation*;] or, whether he does it *mediately*; he will be still found on the scene of action, as the first and grand principle of all efficiency¹. However, as I shall be obliged to speak to this matter again, towards the close of the letter, all that I shall farther observe upon it here will be: That what is now suggested, concerning this real, intimate presence of ALMIGHTY GOD, absolutely runs through the whole system of being, irrational as well as intelligent; but is still more eminent and striking the higher we rise in the scale of existence; till we come to the MEDIATORIAL person himself, where the DIVINE residence is *properly immediate*; and therefore the text says: That *in him* ALL FULNESS *pleased to dwell*². From whence it appears, that we cannot conceive justly of CHRIST, without including *the immediate presence* of THE GODHEAD. But this leads me,

VII. To another preliminary remark, which is this: Namely, that GOD being intimately present with all his creatures, and the first principle of action [I speak of action, *as such*;] especially with regard to the person of OUR

¹ See this argument judiciously and learnedly discuss'd by Dr. Denne, and the authors quoted by him, in *the preface* to his sermon on the wisdom and goodness of GOD in the VEGE-TABLE CREATION, for the year 1733.

² Col. i. 19.—ἐν αὐτῷ ἐυδόκησε ΠΑΝ ΤΟ ΠΛΗΡΩΜΑ κατοικῆσαι.

LORD,

LORD, who is HIS SHEKINAH, OR HABITATION; we must remember, that where ever we find THE ALMIGHTY, there CHRIST is also; and, on the contrary, that where ever CHRIST is, there also is THE ONE GOD: thus uniting, *in our thoughts*, THE DIVINE and MEDIATORIAL BEINGS; as THE SOVEREIGN and *his throne*, or THE DEITY and *his temple*. And thus conceiving them to act in conjunction, through all their concerns with the human species, whether more glorious, or more inconsiderable.

IF we will not submit to this view of THE DIVINE and MEDIATORIAL BEINGS; the one, undeniable consequence will be: that we must then immediately give-up THE GOD of revelation, that is GOD in CHRIST; and, on the contrary, must be thrown into his arms as the absolute, sovereign DEITY of nature: which DEITY, consider'd in that light; I mean, in an absolute remove from the MEDIATORIAL person, is, and cannot but be, *a consuming fire* to all the guilty descendants of *Adam*¹.

BUT, admitting the present connexion [and why should any one choose to separate that, which infinite wisdom has so strictly united for the happiness of every individual? but, I say, admitting the present connexion;] we have immediately A CANON for the full interpretation of all these passages of scripture: A CLUE, that cannot fail to conduct us into their evangelical contents. The reason is: because, as we here

¹ Heb. xii. 29.

stand possess'd of two such different personages as GOD and *man* [for CHRIST, by former accounts, appears to be a *man* ;] we have instantly before us, those *two* natures, which are absolutely necessary to enable us to illustrate the different titles and ascriptions, which occur in these passages ; either taken separately, or on a collation of them together. For example, to instance in a particular, or two :

1. IN the MEDIATORIAL person, as including both the constituent parts of an human intelligence, we have that lower nature, in reference to which, he may with strict propriety be said *to be sent* ; and may, consequently, be truly called by the name of *angel* : While, on the other hand, taking THE DIVINE BEING into the account, supposing him likewise present, we have that glorious majesty, who is capable of bearing us through the ascription of the most exalted characters, and the most transcendant operations.

2. THUS, again, shall we find the matter turn out, in respect to the great subject of BLESSING, which we meet with in one and another of these accounts.—For, as to THE DIVINE BEING, he *blessets*. Undoubtedly, will it be said ; and that, because he is the fountain of being and blessedness. He therefore *blessets* (as it will be farther acknowledged) *in his own right*. Allowed.—But this is not all. For we find that THE ANGEL mention'd in these cases, is not only *prayed to* for a *blessing* [for I dare take the terms in their strictest sense ;] but also,

also, that he *actually blesses*. And, what is the difficulty in the account? Is not CHRIST, *Man* and MEDIATOR? Why then should he not *bless*? Know we not, even in this view of the MEDIATORIAL person, that *all blessings* were originally put into his hands¹? That THE DIVINE BEING, *from everlasting*, made him *the repository* of all gifts and graces, natural and spiritual²? Again: Know we not, that besides the present settlement of all these privileges with the MEDIATORIAL person; *the administration* of all affairs, both in the world and in the church, was likewise intrusted with CHRIST, the MEDIATOR? But has he the actual possession of *all these blessings*? has he also authority to dispose of them, agreeable to original settlements? And yet, is either his power, or his right to distribute them, disputed? It cannot be.—Here then, we immediately see, that CHRIST acts by *a delegated power*; and, therefore, that he also has a right to *bless*, even *by office*.

NOT, my lord, but I must beg leave to assure you, that I can, at no rate, bring myself to think, that this is *the whole* of CHRIST's right in the present affair. For, with submission, I must still insist on the old principle: namely, that, as the person is *prior* to office; so THE SON is *something*, exclusive of office. From whence my inference is: That the matter now under consideration, which is, CHRIST's right

¹ Eph. i. 3.
compared with Eph. i. 3.

² Col. ii. 3. Prov. viii. 22, 23,

to *blefs*; may, and ought to be carried still higher; and, therefore, be actually made a branch of *his nature*, as THE SON of GOD. For, if he be THE SON of GOD [as certainly as SONSHIP implies a *similitude* of nature;] OUR LORD, whether we can explain it, or not, must some how or other, be a partaker with GOD in *his nature*, which is universally acknowledged to be DIVINE. But if CHRIST partake with THE FATHER in true and proper DIVINITY; into what else are we to resolve his *primary* and *personal* claim to the great privilege of *bleffing* others?

I WILL allow that, in consequence of the turn, which things have taken, on *the fall* of our first parents, his investiture with *the mediatorial character* appears an absolute pre-requisite to *the distribution* of all favours [because sin had intirely destroy'd all communication between GOD and man;] but, for OUR LORD's first right to, or personal interest in the privilege itself; surely, we are to look for it, in that connexion, which does *now*, and which did *from everlasting*, subsist between HIM and THE DIVINE BEING. And what less than this can be infer'd from those words of CHRIST? where he tells us, that: *As THE FATHER hath life in himself* [that is, in his own person or nature;] *so hath he given to THE SON, to have life in himself*: [meaning therefore, in HIS own person or nature: *This*, it is true, by *generation*; but *that*, *essential* and *underived*.] And to what

¹ John v. 26.

end? That, in connexion with *his mediatorial charge*, he should dispense *all the blessings* of grace here and glory hereafter, as annumerated in the several verses of that context. But, if THE SON have this privilege as part of his nature; [for *this life*, tho' GIVEN, as is HIS SONSHIP also, seems to me, to imply a *natural*, and not merely a *delegated prerogative* (though that, as intimated above¹, is undoubtedly included; yet, by no means, I imagine, as *the first and highest sense* of the text) because he speaks here of *his person*: He has life IN HIMSELF, *personally consider'd*; and not barely *in consequence of*, or *by office*: I repeat it, if CHRIST originally, as THE SON of GOD, has actual interest in this privilege;] and then, as MEDIATOR, has likewise *official power* to dispense *those blessings*, which are of all other the most valuable and glorious; even the blessings with which *eternal life* is connected; can it ever be once imagined, that THIS same SON has not also equal right in himself, by virtue of the above qualifications, *personal and constitutional*; to dispense *the lower blessings* of time? or, if the case require it, both in conjunction? Because many, if not all the passages of scripture, now refer'd to, include both kinds of *blessings*. The answer, I apprehend, must be in the negative.

3. AND thus I might go on to instance in the affair of WORSHIP. For *true and supreme adoration* to THE FATHER and SON [I use those

¹ See above, p. 172.

terms, because where *WORSHIP* is *strictly divine*, I know not by what means, to justify the distinction of it's being *such in an higher and lower degree*: I say, *true and supreme adoration* to THE ONE GOD and THE ANGEL of *his presence*] comes out with equal clearness and propriety on the same principle. [And this, without setting aside some peculiar ascriptions and acknowledgements to THE DIVINE BEING, in the person of THE FATHER.] Because, as has been said above, these two persons are inseparably connected; so that to take away one, is to destroy both, on *the mediatorial plan*. But, as I design an hint or two on this article in another place, farther enlargement upon it here, will be quite needless.

I CANNOT see, what there can be yet wanting, either to illustrate, or establish the present observation; unless it should be imagin'd, that what has been now advanced, lies open to some such OBJECTION as this: "Is it not certain, that *the appearances* in these scriptural narrations, ever turn on *one person*; whereas, it should seem by the above account, that there are always *two persons* concern'd in them: namely GOD and CHRIST? Will it not therefore follow from hence, either that *the simplicity* of the text is not preserv'd, or that *these two persons* are confounded and made *one*?" I answer:

I. IT is granted that, to account for the different circumstances observable in *these* several appearances, two persons, GOD and CHRIST, are

are supposed absolutely present. But what is there in this, which holds not universally thro' all the parts of creation and providence, and will hold, from the beginning to the end of time; nay, and, I will venture to add, thro' eternity itself? *A pure DEITY, or simple, absolute SPIRIT*, is precisely the object of ETERNITY, *a parte ante*, without the least reference to, or connexion with, any one production, material or intellectual. It is DEITY in a *solitary*, as well as *self-existent* state. Whereas, when we come to take into view the production of the heavens and earth, with their respective inhabitants; the idea has no foundation, till we have first supposed the production of the person of CHRIST, and his being *set-up*, as MEDIATOR, *from everlasting*¹. ALMIGHTY GOD therefore, in my humble opinion, cannot be consider'd as coming forth in any one act of creative power, till we have got a previous sight of CHRIST, as *his first*, and *only immediate production*. But, that suppos'd, then it is, *in and through THIS MEDIATOR*, and *not immediately* in his own person, that he comes forth in the creation of the heavens and the earth. Yet these effects of almighty power, are sometimes spoken of as the works of THE FATHER, and sometimes as the works of CHRIST; and yet *more correctly*, in agreement with what has been here observ'd, as the joint operation of BOTH. For example, where the text saith: GOD [THE FATHER] *created all*

¹ Prov. viii. 23.

things by JESUS CHRIST¹; speaking of CHRIST, not barely as *an instrument*, but as a *co-operative cause* with THE FATHER, by virtue of THE GODHEAD's dwelling *bodily* in CHRIST, and making him a real party in all external manifestations. The consequence then is: That we must have a MEDIATORIAL person for THE ALMIGHTY to reside *in*, and operate *through*; or, we must have neither *any appearances* of GOD, nor *any displays of his power*, in the sacred exhibitions, we are now speaking of.

BUT here it is, indeed, that we *first stumble*; and the case is almost, if not altogether, general: Namely, that men want sadly to *separate* GOD and CHRIST. What I mean, is: that they are only disposed to consider them *as absolutely detached from each other in person*. And this, I imagine, upon the false principle of doing honour to THE FIRST CAUSE, THE ONE, SUPREME GOD.

WHEREAS, to consider them, on the plan of revelation, in this *distant, unconnected* manner; is not only, in the first place, to destroy the true personal Construction of GOD and CHRIST; but also, to dishonour THE FIRST CAUSE in the highest degree possible.—It destroys their persons: Because, on the part of GOD, there is now [that is, speaking of THE DEITY, not in *his pure, abstract nature*; but on the *mediatorial plan*: there is now] no such being as *an absolute*, and, I will say, *simple, unembodied SPIRIT*. It being notorious, that THE GOD of re-

¹ Eph. iii. 9.

velation is AN infinite SPIRIT ; collecting himself, for all the purposes of manifestation and operation, into the person of CHRIST, as into *his tabernacle*. And, again : because, on the part of CHRIST, he is no such being as *a mere, simple man* ; at the same distance from THE ALMIGHTY as we, the other branches of the human nature ; but that branch of our species, in which (according to the express, literal declarations of scripture) it *has pleased* ALL FULLNESS, meaning, THE FULLNESS OF THE GOD-HEAD, *to dwell bodily* ¹.

BUT, if this be a true representation of their respective personal structure ; suffer me to ask : How can the DIVINE majesty, THE ONE GOD, be more egregiously affronted, than when we dispute his sovereignty and wisdom in the present settlement of himself ? If he has deign'd to dwell in a branch of our nature, and *set* that person *up*, as principal, under himself, thro' both worlds ; why is he not to be owned in this dispensation of things ? Why is he not to be honour'd in this, *his prime* constitution ? Wherefore,

ONCE more : If there be absolutely this connexion between the DIVINE and MEDIATORIAL persons ; if the DIVINE majesty really *dwells* in CHRIST, and *does* every thing *by*, and *together with* CHRIST ; how is it possible totally to *separate*, or *divide* them, in their concerns with the several orders of their creatures ? May we

¹ Col. i. 19. compared with ch. ii. 9.

not as well think, without the least injury accruing, to take the soul from the body ; or the sun out of our system ? It is to be observed, however,

2. IN the next place, that we have it in our power, and likewise ought carefully, to *distinguish* these persons ; though we cannot, in a consistency with scripture-revelation, *detach*, or *divide* them from each other. — As to those, who imagine, that I may be here in danger of confounding the DIVINE and MEDIATORIAL persons : their fears are intirely groundless. Because the thing, in itself, is utterly impossible. For tell me, you that raise the objection : What is the art, by which we are so to compound *an infinite* and *a finite spirit* [for here lies the original, abstract difference of nature ;] as to make them *one spirit*, *one intelligence* ? Surely, that, which is infinite, must ever be infinite ; and that, which is finite, be also ever finite, in it's own abstract nature. Wherefore, if it pleases ALL DIVINE FULNESS to fix *it's tabernacle* in a branch of the human nature ; what is the alteration, what the diminution, THAT infinite FULNESS can thereby suffer ? GOD, I hope, will be GOD, let him, for the purposes of external manifestation and operation, dwell where he will ; collect his perfections into what point ; display his glories through what medium, he pleases. What is infinite, is impassible, invulnerable. True, *the tabernacle* gains unspeakably ; *the medium* is honour'd beyond description ; but, however, not changed. Where
GOD

GOD dwells, there centres THE DIVINE FULLNESS: thence beam forth THE DIVINE GLORIES. This raises, this dignifies, that individual nature; lifts it, I may say, into a *partnership* with DEITY; infinitely above the mere creature: but, it alters not the specific nature of the person, chose for this residence. He is still *a man*; only *the man* God's fellow¹.

How is it with ourselves? Is it not said, that *we live, and move* [or, *are moved*²,] *and have our being in God*³? Do we not stand incircled by the infinitely-extended arms of THE DEITY? Do we not exist within the verge of the DIVINE essence? This, however, is all natural; all common to us, *as men*. Be the inquiry then: What is the state of the case with *Christians*; those, properly so called? Now concerning these the account is: That they are *the temple of THE living God*. Such of whom THE ALMIGHTY declares, saying: *I will dwell in them and walk in them*⁴.—Nay, they are described as such, *who are partakers of a* [or, in a sense, even of *the*] *divine nature*⁵.—What then is the alteration, consequent upon all this? Nothing, that affects our nature, as creatures of the human species. We are still *men*; and shall always remain such, be our approaches to THE DEITY ever so near; our converse with GOD ever so intimate.—Just such is the case between GOD and CHRIST: The one for ever *infinite*, the other (all relation

¹ Zech. xiii. 7.

28.

² κινούμεθα.⁴ 2 Cor. vi. 16, 18.³ Acts xvii.⁵ 2 Pet. i. 4.

to DEITY apart) for ever *finite*. Wherefore, what belongs to GOD, belongs to him for ever, without change : what belongs to *man*, belongs also to him for ever, without variation of essence. The conclusion from which is : that THE ONE GOD and THE ONE MEDIATOR are, and cannot but be, *personally distinct*. But, though this be absolute fact, it will, nevertheless, be observed,

3. IN respect to *the appearances*, now under examination, that, in some cases, the marks of the DIVINE presence are more immediately conspicuous ; and, in others, the marks of the the MEDIATORIAL presence. By which means it comes to pass, that we have that variety in the representation ; in some instances the name of JEHOVAH being heard, in others, the name of *an angel*, or *man*, only. What then is our business ? Merely, to *distinguish* in these particulars. Because the *higher* character is founded precisely in THE DIVINITY ; and the *lower* character is founded precisely in *the humanity*. Let us, I say, be careful to *distinguish* in these particulars ; but, let us not *confound them*. For as GOD and CHRIST have their different parts, though mutually concern'd ; so shall we find some accounts more peculiarly suited to the one person, and some more peculiarly suited to the other ; yet, as was said before, both attendant on the occasion and operative together. By which method, again, all confusion is readily avoided. But that GOD and CHRIST always act in concert, is a principle

ple never to be given up. Because, I will venture to say, the only principle, that can carry us, not through *the present appearances* only; but through *all the concerns* of creation, providence and grace.

I AM sensible, that the dispute, in this case between your lordship and me, will be this, agreeable to an assertion laid down at SECTION XC: That it was not *the one, only, invisible* God, who *was manifested in the flesh*; but, what you call, *a secondary god*, that is to say, *Michael*.—How far this comports with repeated declarations, made both by OUR SAVIOUR and by his apostles, on this subject; I reserve for consideration in a second letter, should the present have merit enough to recommend itself to the public. In the mean time, I scruple not to assert: That the same DIVINE person, to whom OUR LORD ascribes both *his doctrine* and *miracles* in the days of his flesh; was likewise THAT JEHOVAH, who was present with him, in *all the appearances* he made, and *the works* he wrought before his incarnation¹. Nor have we any thing more to do

¹ BUT, though I keep the full explication of this subject in reserve; I must, probably, to prevent being misunderstood in what has been now said, be obliged to the following occasional remark: That when I assert *this manifestation of THE DIVINE BEING, or FATHER, in the flesh*; I, by no means, intend: That THE eternal GOD, commonly called THE FATHER, *became incarnate*; that is, took an human body into *personal union* with himself: For *that*, I suppose, terminates wholly on *the pre-existing spirit of THE LOGOS*. But what I mean, is: That when

do in these cases (as was observed above) but *to distinguish* their persons from each other; at the same time, that we connect them in all external operations. For as THE FATHER involves *the humanity* of CHRIST; CHRIST likewise involves THE DIVINITY of THE FATHER. The consequence of which is: That we have here an effectual provision for the reciprocal use of all characters between the DIVINE and MEDIATORIAL beings. Hence therefore it is, that as *hands, eyes, feet, &c.* may be applied to THE invisible, eternal SPIRIT, because he dwells in CHRIST; who, *as man*, possesses those organs: So, *all* DIVINE names, *perfections, works and attributes*, may be ascribed to CHRIST, because he dwells in GOD; and therefore sees as much with the eyes of GOD [meaning, his *omniscience*] as GOD, sees with the eyes of CHRIST, in consequence of his dwelling in him.

THIS, then, I will venture to say, is THE GOD of revelation: This THE MEDIATOR of revelation: Beings *distinct* in their persons; but having *joint interest* in all external operations; and, therefore, in *the appearances* I am now speaking of, among the rest. But then,

when CHRIST [who subsisted *from everlasting* as a truly human spirit, in respect of his metaphysical, abstract nature; that is, setting ALL DEITY apart: when CHRIST] had taken a body of the virgin into *personal union* with himself, this pre-existent human spirit; THE DIVINE BEING, or FATHER, *still dwelt* as really and fully in CHRIST, now possessing both the constituent parts of the man; as he had done, before, *from everlasting*, in the pre-existent spirit itself, only.

VIII. LASTLY,

VIII. LASTLY, There is yet one thing more, which requires particular consideration, before I attempt the inspection of the scriptures themselves : And this is *the general principle*, on which your lordship undertakes to explain these scriptural histories in favour of *Michael*, the archangel. Now this we are to collect from SECTION LIH, where you are pleased to tell us : That “ *Philo Judeus*—observes, that “ this Archangel with many Names, whose “ Portion was *Israel*, was also called by *the* “ Name of God. He does not”, indeed, as your lordship farther remarks, pretend to “ mention that Name of God by which this “ Archangel was denominated, but says only, “ in general, that he was called by *the Name* “ of God”.——Your lordship, therefore, to assist in this particular, and supply *Philo's* deficiency ; has not scrupled to assert, that this is no other than the name, *JEHOVAH*. *Philo* then, having laid this foundation ; your lordship apprehends, that there needs nothing farther to establish the doctrine, than to produce certain instances out of the old testament, where *an angel* [taking it, at the same time, for granted, that it must be the archangel *Michael*] is called by the name, *JEHOVAH*.

BUT, will your lordship permit me to ask, in reference to *this principle* : Whether, or no (supposing the prejudices of a favourite scheme were not in the way ;) it is not much more natural, to conclude *the direct contrary* to what

what your lordship has here advanc'd ; and that, for *the very reason* on which it has been advanc'd : I mean, because we find *the ineffable name* of GOD (as *The Jews* call it) perpetually occurs in these passages of scripture?—Would not this perpetual use of the word, naturally lead any disinterested person to suspect, that where *the incommunicable name* of GOD is given to a person, appearing under the character of *an angel* ; that there must certainly be something more in the history, than the presence of *a mere creature* ? I confess, the mystery with me is, how any intelligent person can in such manner, prevail upon himself, as to believe : That THAT GOD, who is so extremely jealous in the matter of *his praise*, that *he will not give his glory to another* ¹ ; should yet, according to your lordship, not only be contented to resign his *most distinguished* character ² to a created angel, occasionally ; but that, in consequence of your doctrine, he should comply with it in such numerous instances. I beg your lordship to reflect, whether a principle of this kind be not, to contradict the nature of ALMIGHTY GOD ; to subvert the doctrines of revelation ; and to cancel that great law, called *the reason and fitness of things*. For if, where *the name* of GOD, even his *incommunicable name*, is attributed to any one person thus appearing ; we may not be allowed to conclude, that there GOD himself

¹ Isa. xlii. 8.
Hos. xii. 5.

² Exod. iii. 15. compared with

must,

must, some how or other, be *particularly* and *personally* concern'd: there is then, I think, an intire end of all language; or, rather, indeed, an intire end of all scripture; all *revealed* religion. Because, upon this plan, it appears absolutely unintelligible; affording us *no certain clue*, by which to trace out it's most important doctrines.

WHEREFORE, taking these hints along with us, I suspect, that the matter of fact, in the present question, is really this: Namely, that for as much as there is, in all these cases, a kind of *embassy* from heaven; a person, we will suppose, detached from thence, either to convey intelligence, or minister consolation, or, it may be, both; on some extraordinary occasions, and to certain members of the church peculiarly favour'd by ALMIGHTY GOD: there is, undoubtedly, in *this legation*, proper reason to consider the person thus dispatch'd, under the character of *an angel*; proper reason to call him by that name; whether he be actually *an angel*, in point of nature, or not. But then, as the matter in this precise view of it, would certainly leave us in suspense; and we should be liable, without farther information in the premises, to form a wrong judgment concerning *the nature* of this personage: it is observable, that the narrative by no means stops here; but, either in the sequel of the history, or on a comparison of it's different parts; enables us to subjoin this *additional* remark: Namely, that for as much as this person,

son, who is called *an angel* (on account of his ministry) in one part of the description; is, likewise, as positively call'd by the *ineffable* name of GOD, in another part of it; we are to believe this, very graciously intended by heaven, to serve as an incentive to farther inquiry. Because it will appear, if we look closer into matters, that this part of the account contains in it: In the first place, *an absolute caution* to the intelligent reader, that he do not presume to injure the character of the person, thus appearing, so far, as to consider him in the light of *a mere creature*. And, in the next place, *an express direction*, obliging us to conclude, that, as the *incommunicable* name of GOD is *called upon this person*¹; so, in the true sense of the text, ALMIGHTY GOD himself, even THE ETERNAL JEHOVAH, is *really present with THIS ANGEL*; and, whether we can explain *the modus* of the connexion, or not, *personally resident in him*. This then directing us, on the one part, to consider THE ANGEL in these appearances, as no other than THE ANGEL *of the covenant*; leads us again, on the other, to conclude: That, as THE DIVINE SHEKINAH is here attendant; so, likewise, THE DEITY inseparable from it. And, as this method of interpretation brings us to a point; so, it lets us see, that the contents of all these scriptures intirely center in THE ONE GOD and THE ONE MEDIATOR: The former, as was observ'd above, fully securing *all the*

¹ Acts xv. 17.

higher characters; and the latter, leading into a familiar account of *all the inferior*.

HAVING then, in these several *preliminary* observations, the necessary lights to qualify for inspecting *the appearances themselves*; my next business shall be the examination of those passages of scripture, which your lordship has selected on the present occasion. And

THE FIRST is that, where *Hagar* is represented as flying from the face of her mistress; on which it is said; that THE ANGEL of JEHOVAH found her in the wilderness—and THE ANGEL of JEHOVAH said unto her: return to thy mistress¹.

NOW, the observation, which your lordship makes on this passage, is: That, “tho’ *Moses* in this Place calls the Person who spake to *Hagar* an [in the text, it is *the*] Angel of *Jehovah*, yet *Moses* afterwards mentions this same Person under the direct Name of *Jehovah*: For, says he, *Hagar called the Name of JEHOVAH that spake to her, Thou God seest me*²”. From whence your lordship infers, that a created angel, and particularly *Michael*, may be called by the name JEHOVAH. But, in return to this, it will be proper to observe as follows:

I. THAT the thing, which should be *proved*, is here only *supposed* or *affirmed*. For as I cannot but persuade myself, your lordship will

¹ Gen. xvi. 7, 9.

² Ibid. v. 13. *Essay*, §. liv.

acknowledge; that nothing, in the present case, ought to be admitted, but what amounts to *strict proof*: So, I would hope, that your lordship is, by this time, fully convinc'd, by what has been suggested above; that *the general principle*, on which you set out in the explication of these scriptures¹, is so far from making to it's support, that it is absolutely a full testimony against your *hypothesis*. However, if that be not sufficient, my next business shall be

II. To draw out the whole evidence the present passage affords, in opposition to your lordship's inference from it, more distinctly and at large. Wherefore,

I. FIRST of all, the very application of the title JEHOVAH to the person said to appear on the present occasion, is as strong a proof as need be desir'd, that such person was by no means a mere creature, not excepting *Michael* himself. For though CHRIST, as MEDIATOR; and GOD himself in CHRIST, may have, and, indeed, actually have, the name of *angel* attributed to them; it being, on these occasions, given to CHRIST, as *pre-existing* in his human spirit, and, as being, therefore, capable of *mission*, in the strict sense of the word; and, it being likewise given to GOD, by reason of his dwelling in CHRIST, and therefore manifesting himself to his favourites under the old testament, in and through him, as THE ANGEL

¹ See Preliminary Observation, No. VIII.

of the covenant : I repeat it ; though there is certainly an application of the present character [*angel*] both to GOD and CHRIST ; yet, I may challenge the whole world to prove, that there ever was any such *phenomenon*, wherein the *incommunicable* name, JEHOVAH [a name of nature ; a name, peculiarly descriptive of the DIVINE essence, as the one self-existent being, and the fountain of being universally ; wherein that name] was ever known to be transfer'd from GOD himself, or CHRIST (the persons to whom it is always sacred) to any one mere creature of what order, or rank soever. How can it possibly be ? When, as, in part, was observed above, the nature of THE DIVINE BEING ; the constitution of the MEDIATORIAL person ; and the reason and truth of things, are so many positive contradictions to a supposition of that kind ¹.

NOT

¹ I am not ignorant, that this character, JEHOVAH, is, more than once, given to *the ark*, under the *legal* oeconomy : *Rise up, LORD, and let thine enemies be scattered, &c.* Numb. x. 35, 36. But, who that knows, what *the ark* was ; whether as *the repository* of the divine law, or, as *an immediate symbol* of GOD's presence among *The Jews* ; but will readily confess, that the true reason of this application, was, *that strict connexion*, which, by this means, obtained between THE DIVINE BEING himself and *the ark*, as the token of his actual residence with the *Jewish church* ; and, therefore, that it was not *the ark itself*, properly speaking ; but THAT GOD, who had made it *his visible seat or throne*, that was directly intended by this character, JEHOVAH.—This, however, being only *an instrument* dedicated by GOD to certain religious uses ; does not amount to *the challenge* here made : Which is, to produce an instance, where either a *mere man*, or a *created angel*, is ever called by the name JEHOVAH. Nor can this be done, till it is first proved ; that there is *the*

NOT but, I might here also take occasion to remark, from an observation, which your lordship has been so kind to make for me: That those good friends of your lordship, the *Septuagint* translators of *The Bible*, in conjunction with the body of their nation; persons, that your lordship is, occasionally, exceeding fond of; come in as witnesses against you, in this part of the controversy. For, what is the account we have of them, from your lordship, in this point?—"The Name of God, which the *Jews* never pronounced, but called it the ineffable Name, was *Jehovah*; so that, whenever in reading the Bible, they met with this Word, instead thereof, they always said *Adonai* or *Elohim*; and the Authors of the *Septuagint* Translation of the Bible, who were *Jews*, when they rendered it into *Greek*, always translated it by the Word *Κύριος*, which we in *English* render the Lord¹".

BUT, were *The Jews*, in general, so extremely cautious in reference to this word, *JEHOVAH*, as not to let the sound of it break from their lips; and will your lordship so readily give it up to a mere creature? so strenuously plead for the archangel's property in it? Does not their conduct tell us, in the strongest

same connexion between THE ALMIGHTY, and some one, or more of *these creatures*, which is known to subsist between God and CHRIST. For, it is to be observ'd, even in the case here alledged: That *the ark* was the same in figure, which CHRIST himself is in substance.

¹ §. LIII.

manner,

manner, that they look'd upon it as the glorious peculiar of DIVINITY? And would neither their doctors pretend to insert it in the *Greek* translation of the old testament; nor the body of the *Jewish* nation presume to utter it in reading the scriptures; and is it, at last, become so common, and of such trifling import, that a mere creature may share it with THE ALMIGHTY? No: let both *The* ancient and modern *Jews*, teach us greater reverence for the name itself; and let us infer from their practice in this case: That if they could not indulge themselves the liberty of pronouncing it, though used in strict reference to THE DIVINE BEING himself; we may be positive they were very far from supposing, that it could be either proper or safe, to apply it to any mere creature whatsoever. Again,

2. IT is very observable, that *the* promise here made to *Hagar* by THIS ANGEL, is exactly of the same nature, or purport, with that made to *Abraham*, in the xviith chapter of *Genesis*, verses 2 and 6, compar'd with ch. xv. 5. namely, that *he would multiply her seed exceedingly* ¹.

NOW, to enter fully into the contents of this part of the history, it must be observed, not only, that *Ismael* was the beloved child of a favourite patriarch, and therefore one, we may suppose, dear to heaven for the father's sake; but also that, in the opposition between *Hagar* and *Sarah*, was typically held forth,

¹ Gen. xvi. 10.

the old and the new covenants, or the law and the gospel. These then are reasons (through the condescending mercy of that God, who chose to distinguish *Abraham*;) why every thing, relative to the present and future circumstances of *Hagar* and her child, should become the peculiar object of THE ALMIGHTY's regard. Is there not then, proper ground to conclude, from these circumstances, taken in connexion with OUR LORD's general character, and the business, that was his delight, as THE ANGEL of the covenant (namely, his visiting this earth;) that he would himself appear on this extraordinary occasion? For as much as the circumstance, introductory to the opening of these great events, or, to the giving a display to the councils of heaven respecting these two women; was, *this of Hagar's return to her mistress*: That leading the way to *Ishmael's* being born in *Abraham's* house ¹; to his being circumcised ², and to his unbecoming deportment towards *Sarah*; and therefore to the joint expulsion of *Hagar* and her son, at last, by *Abraham* ³.

WHO then cannot see, as was said above, that as these were concerns of remarkable importance, not only in regard to *Abraham* himself, in his person and family; but also, in regard to the legal and evangelical states of the church in general, here typically refer'd to: So, that it is much more natural to suppose,

¹ Gen. xvi. 15.
ch. xxi. 9, 10, &c.

² Ib. ch. xvii. 25, 26.

³ Ib.

that

that CHRIST would himself appear to *Hagar* on the present occasion ; than that he would leave this work to any created angel whatever?—The general reason is, that these are events in which CHRIST himself, and therefore THE ALMIGHTY in him ; are intimately and personally concern'd. But to go on,

3. IT might be farther urged, in maintenance of what I have here advanced : That there is *a certain propriety* in the application of the title, JEHOVAH to OUR SAVIOUR, which cannot be found, either with the archangel, or any of the angelical species. The disproportion, indeed, between CHRIST and them, is so great, as to admit of no possible comparison. For, as OUR SAVIOUR, THE ANGEL *of the covenant*, is THE SHEKINAH, the tabernacle of ALMIGHTY GOD ; the *personal* Image, as I may say, of the one, eternal JEHOVAH ; who, among the several orders of angels in the heavens, may be *likened* unto him ? Who, among the sons of the mighty, upon earth, may be *compared* with him ? Unto which, either of those above, or of these below, did THE ALMIGHTY ever say (in that sense, in which he uses the word, when he speaks of CHRIST :) *Thou art MY SON, this day have I begotten thee* ? Wherefore, the assertion brings it's own evidence along with it, when we affirm : That, exclusive of PURE DEITY, there is not, there cannot be, any one in the scale of intelligent beings, who can with any truth, or propriety,

¹ Heb. i. 5.

bear the *Incommunicable* name, except it be that person, in whom JEHOVAH himself *dwells bodily*; and, therefore, that person, who reflects all the glories of the DIVINE nature. But this truth will yet appear with additional lustre, when,

4. WE have consider'd more particularly, on *what principle* it is, that this transfer of the *ineffable* name from GOD to CHRIST; or, which is much the same thing, the joint use of it between them on certain occasions, is known to take place. Now, there is the same reason, why OUR SAVIOUR and ALMIGHTY GOD, should be spoken of by the same common name; even that of JEHOVAH; as there is for the like intercourse of character or title, between CHRIST and the church. Because, as the church exists in CHRIST, and therefore is called by his name¹; so, CHRIST exists in GOD, and is therefore as justly called by his name. Nor so only: But the church is called CHRIST, because every individual, in his mystical body, truly partakes of the nature of CHRIST, their head². Wherefore, if community of nature lay a proper foundation for this intercourse between CHRIST and his followers; surely, a community of nature between JEHOVAH and THE ANGEL *of his presence* (resulting from THE GODHEAD within;) must be allowed to lay a foundation equally

¹ 1 Cor. xii. 12.

² Ibid. ch. vi. 17.

proper;

proper, for a transfer of this kind between THE FATHER and CHRIST. But then,

5. LASTLY, If there be yet any evidence wanting to account for *the promiscuous*, or *reciprocal use* of these two characters; I mean, why the same person, who is called *angel* in one part of the account, may likewise be called JEHOVAH in another part of it; and so, *vice versa*: All that we have farther to do, is, to refer ourselves directly to THE CANON of interpretation exhibited above; in the application of which, we shall find the whole mystery immediately unravel'd. For, as to the lower character; namely, that of *angel*: Here is CHRIST himself, THE ANGEL of *the covenant*, to support it; be the word *angel*, as a title of office, explain'd with the severest restriction. And then, as to the higher character; namely, JEHOVAH: We have here, in and with CHRIST, THIS ANGEL of *the covenant*, THE Almighty God personally present; and as inseparably connected with CHRIST, as THE DEITY and HIS SHEKINAH. What then want we farther, to account for both characters? And to account for them with ease and propriety? Without laying ourselves open to a supposition so injurious to the dignity of OUR SAVIOUR, and so unworthy THE MAJESTY of heaven; as that the person thus appearing, is merely a created angel, *commission'd* by JEHOVAH for these purposes, and therefore assuming his *incommunicable* name. I come now to

A SE-

A SECOND passage of scripture adduced by your lordship on this subject; which we find in the xviiith of *Genesis*, the first and following verses: *And JEHOVAH appeared unto him [Abraham] in the plains of Mamre, and he sat in the tent-door, in the heat of the day. And he lift up his eyes, and looked, and lo, three men stood by him.* After this, reciting other particulars in the chapter; namely, that JEHOVAH, as one of these persons, *said unto Abraham, Why did Sarah laugh?* And again, that *Abraham*, “when two of the men had turned their “faces from thence” *stood yet before JEHOVAH:* Together with that passage from the next chapter, where it is said: *JEHOVAH rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from JEHOVAH out of heaven:* Your lordship draws this observation from the history at large: “That two of the Persons which are “here called men, — had each of them the “Appellation of *Jehovah* given them”. Wherefore to shew the pravity of this conclusion, I propose, after your lordship’s example, to examine the context; and, likewise, in a particular instance, to compare this context with another passage of scripture relative to the subject.

I. FIRST then, for what concerns the character of these three persons, *as men*. The reason of their being called by that name, is

plainly, that assign'd by your lordship: viz.
 "Because they *appeared* as such!". Notwithstanding,

II. If we look farther into matters, we shall find, that though the three are indifferently called *men*, in the preceding part of the chapter; yet that the context, afterwards, distinguishes between them; by calling one [and but one] of them JEHOVAH. Thus it is said, at the 16th verse: *That the men rose up from thence, and looked toward Sodom: And that, Abraham went with them to bring them on the way.* This is an account of their immediate departure from *Abraham's* tent, after their having been entertained by him there; and is to be understood, I suppose, of their departing together in a body; that is, all the three, with *Abraham* attending them. But then, if we descend to the 22d verse, we shall find a farther relation concerning these three persons; and, likewise, that distinction between them, I have here mention'd. For in this verse the account runs thus: *And the men turned their faces from thence, and went towards Sodom.* [That is, as your lordship explains it, and as is evident from the words of the text; *two of the men* turned their faces from thence, and went towards *Sodom.*] But, with respect to *the third*, it is said: *Abraham* stood yet before JEHOVAH. From whence it appears, that one of these three persons, and but one (tho'

called a *man* in common with the other two) was no other than THE LORD [JEHOVAH.] But, in order to support this present distinction, and acquaint ourselves more particularly with the true nature of these three persons, it will be proper to observe farther,

III. THAT, as to those two, who are here called *men*, and who are now set out on a farther progress; we read no more of them in the remaining part of the chapter. For which this good reason is to be given: Namely, that as it appears by the whole of their conduct, that their business in the visit now made to *Abraham*, was only to wait on the other person, called JEHOVAH, as his retinue: So, this end of their appearance being answer'd, it was proper, they should now take their leave of JEHOVAH and *Abraham* (as we find they did;) and attend a particular commission, which we have reason to suppose, from the sequel of the history, they had been charged with by THIS JEHOVAH. Here then the question will be: What was this private commission, wherein these two persons, called *men*, were more immediately concern'd? The general answer is: The intended overthrow of *Sodom* and the adjacent cities. This therefore leads us to inquire farther: What *rout* did they take after their departure from the plains of *Mamre*? This, I apprehend, is not only clearly intimated to us by its being said: That *they turned their faces from thence, and went towards Sodom*; but is also

also fully confirmed to us by the beginning of the subsequent chapter, where we are positively told: That *there came two angels to Sodom at even* ¹. Wherefore, putting the time of their arrival, and other circumstances from the preceding chapter, together; I imagine, there is no room to doubt, but that these *two angels*, are the same individual persons, who were called *men* in that chapter; and who, to prosecute their orders, had left JEHOVAH and *Abraham* in close converse, as mentioned above.

BUT, to this information from the context, it will be proper to add St. *Paul's* testimony in the case; who, referring to this history, expressly calls the persons entertain'd by *Lot* [who, by all circumstances, appear to be the two, termed *men*, in the foregoing chapter; expressly calls them] by the name of *angels*; using the word in it's strict or proper sense ². This then, I apprehend, is a sufficient proof, that *two* of these three persons, appearing to *Abraham*, neither were, nor could be, by any means, call'd JEHOVAH; but one of them only: Namely, that person, who continued with *Abraham*; after the other two, who were literally angels, had turned their faces from thence, and were making their way towards *Sodom*. This then leads me

¹ Gen. xix. 1.

² Heb. xii. 2.

IV. IN the next place, to consider, more particularly, who this *third person* was, to whom the appellation of JEHOVAH was truly and properly given. And here, I am greatly mistaken, if the context will not bear me out in asserting: That it was, by no means, any created angel whatever. Nevertheless, to evince this, it may be necessary to observe as follows:

1. THE particular DEFERENCE, with which *Abraham* treats him, by addressing himself, even while in company with the other two, in a more immediate manner, to this third person, separately; saying: MY LORD [ADONAI, the name by which he bespeaks him in the latter part of the chapter, when conversing about *Sodom*: MY LORD] *if now I have found favour in thy sight, pass not away, I pray thee, from thy servant*¹. Proof enough, that he bore visible marks of pre-eminence in the eyes of *Abraham*; and, therefore, that his quality and nature were greatly different from the other two. Nor is that all; for

2. LET us consider *the work*, in which he appears immediately concern'd on the present occasion, and this was two-fold:

1.) TO renew *the promise* of an heir to *Abraham* by *Sarah*, his wife. Work, which, we shall find, the true JEHOVAH, even ALMIGHTY God himself (if there be any judging of language) *personally* concern'd in, if we consult the xvth and xviith chapters of *Genesis*.

¹ Gen. xviii. 3.

Work,

Work, therefore, with which no created angel [speaking and promising, *authoratively*, in his own name ;] had ever been intrusted : As well, because it was of two exalted a nature in itself ; as, because THE MEDIATOR was too nearly concern'd in it. For, we must know, that OUR SAVIOUR, *according to the flesh*¹, was to descend from the loins of *Abraham*. Wherefore this part of his business [including not barely a creative energy, but even a power to controul the laws of nature ;] abundantly proves, that the person, of whom I am speaking, was greatly superior, not only to angels in common, but even to *Michael*, the archangel. Add to this,

2.) THE OTHER part of his present business, which was to communicate to *Abraham*, as the favourite patriarch, his design of *overthrowing the cities of the plain*². Work, again, which was only befitting THE ALMIGHTY, immediately ; or, rather, THE ALMIGHTY in, and with HIS SHEKINAH, to reveal and execute ; for the display of his sovereignty on the one part, and his strict justice on the other. This then is the purport of the latter part of the chapter. In which conversation it is pro-

¹ As to the phrase [*according to the flesh*] notwithstanding I have used it, in some places above, in the popular way, to signify the whole human nature of CHRIST ; yet, I am humbly of opinion, that it ought, rather, to be restrain'd, to his assumption of a body only from the virgin. And therefore, that it stands directly oppos'd, to the production of his spirit, both as human, and as the immediate work of THE FATHER, from everlasting.

² Gen. xiii. 12. compared with xix. 25.

per we should consider *the agust titles*, under which this great personage stands represented. And here we cannot but remark,

(1.) THAT the one is, the *incommunicable* name itself, *viz.* that of JEHOVAH. For this is the character by which the inspir'd historian always speaks of him in this chapter, as may be seen by consulting, verses 1, 13, 14, 17, 20, 22 and 33. And though *Abraham* from humility, and in reverence to the *ineffable* name, still uses the term ADONAI; yet we are sensible, that one and the same personage is intended throughout. And, therefore, that he has undoubted right to be consider'd, as justly intitled to the *incommunicable* name. Not but this fully comports with your lordship's sentiments on the head. The observation, however, which I have to make from this use of the word, is: The shocking impropriety, which attends, in giving the *inalienable* character of ALMIGHTY GOD to any mere creature, whether angel, or archangel. But, I refer for this, to the enlargement already made under the preceding text. Wherefore,

(2.) IT is observable, that *Abraham* here addresses this person by the title of THE JUDGE of all the earth¹. Now, this single character does, of itself, absolutely determine the subject to whom it is applied; telling us, that it can be no less person than THE LOGOS, THE SON of GOD. Because we are well assur'd, from concurring testimony of scripture, that the

¹ Gen. xviii. 25.

person, to whom all judgment is committed, is, THE SON *. Which SON, even as MEDIATOR, always includes the indwelling of the DIVINE majesty. And therefore it is said: That GOD will judge the world in righteousness by that man, whom he hath ordained †; meaning THE SON. So that, supposing even THE ALMIGHTY himself, here really present and personally concerned in this character (as we may with the last truth and propriety suppose;) it is only inverting the proposition, and the matter comes out exactly the same. For, as then, JEHOVAH in HIS SHEKINAH will be *this judge of all the earth*; so, in the other view of the subject, THE SHEKINAH, with THE indwelling JEHOVAH, will appear the person intended.—
[A plain proof, among the rest (if the digression may be excused) of this general principle: That it is the ONE GOD himself, who does every thing *in*, and *by* CHRIST; and, therefore, that THE ONE GOD and THE ONE MEDIATOR are never to be separated.]

THIS then, I imagine, is farther demonstrative proof, that but one of these three persons, was called JEHOVAH; and that he is so called, not because he was a created angel with a certain quantity of *delegated power*, but (referring the character to OUR LORD) because he was actually THE SHEKINAH, or HABITATION, of the true JEHOVAH; and, therefore, that together with THIS SHEKINAH, THE one, eternal JEHOVAH was actually present.

* John v. 22.

† Acts xvii. 31.

HAVING then proved, this to be the case, with regard to the history in the xviiiith chapter; let us now see, how the matter stands, with regard to what we find in the xixth chapter.

THIS then, opens by telling us: *There came two angels to Sodom, at even.* Upon which, together with the context, particularly verse the 24th, your lordship infers in these words: " Whence it is plain, that one of these two " Angels is here also dignified with the appellation of *Jehovah* ¹ ".

BUT, will your lordship permit me to observe, in contradiction to this inference: That I have before proved, on no less testimony than that of *St. Paul*, that the persons, who came to *Sodom*, and were entertain'd by *Lot*, were *literal angels*, and such only. And the reason for it is plain, namely, that THE true JEHOVAH (whether you understand the character of ALMIGHTY GOD or of CHRIST;) having completed his business in the preceding chapter, left *Abraham*, and made his return to heaven ²: In consequence of which, the other two, called *men* in the xviiiith chapter, and *angels* in this; were left alone, and were going on in the execution of their immediate charge; that is to say, the overthrow of *Sodom* and *Gomorrhah*.

BESIDES which, there is also this farther ground of exception to the present account by your lordship; that no valid reason can be

¹ §. lvi.

² Gen. xviii. 33.

given, why one, and not both, of these two angels, should be called JEHOVAH. For, what are the particulars, by which the one is distinguished from the other? Where are the superior names, or superior business, given to the one, in preference to the other? On the contrary, as they evidently appear to be detached on the same common business; so they likewise appear to be on a level in respect of nature, as well as character; being truly and properly, each of them *literal angels*, the ministers of ALMIGHTY GOD; or, which comes to the same point, of CHRIST, THE MEDIATOR.

BUT, to set this matter in a more distinct light, let the particular passage in this history, from which your lordship more especially draws the present conclusion, be brought into view, and critically examined; and the words are these: *Then JEHOVAH rained upon Sodom, and upon Gomorrah, brimstone and fire from JEHOVAH out of heaven*¹.—Now, to demonstrate that your lordship's conclusion in this case has been premature, let the following plain interpretations of the passage be considered:

I. FIRST, Your lordship cannot but know, that those words, *from THE LORD*, are only added to the word *fire*, immediately preceding, to describe that *meteor*, which is called *lightning*; and, in it's more violent action, *the*

¹ Genesis xix. 24.

thunder-bolt. Your lordship is, doubtless, sensible, that this is the true use of the phrase; and, consequently, that it can make nothing to your present purpose. Because it by no means intimates a *plurality* or *diversity* of persons concern'd in this act; but, as has been just observ'd, is barely descriptive of that phenomenon, which was frequently called *the fire of God*, or *the fire from God*, both by *The Hebrews* ¹ and those of other nations ².

So that, in this view of the words, the sense of the text is plainly this: Namely, that "JEHOVAH [THE LORD,] besides raining *brimstone* from heaven; did, likewise, rain, or "pour forth, *his lightning* from heaven". Thus instructing us into the precise materials, by which these cities were destroyed: *viz.* By *brimstone inflamed*.—Not that this, though a very just interpretation, is the only way of accounting for the present phraseology; because I have to observe,

II. SECONDLY, That your lordship, cannot but farther know, that the repetition of *the*

¹ 2 Kings i. 12. Isa. lxvi. 16.

² Hence *The Greeks* call *sulphur* or *brimstone* ΘΕΙΟΝ, h. e. DIVINE. Because *the thunderbolt*, or *lightning*, which is a *sulphureous exhalation*, having the smell and force of *brimstone*, is supposed to come from God. *Le Clerc's Dissertation*. And on the same principle, they term waters of a *sulphureous quality*, or *smell*; ὕδατα ΘΕΙΩΔΗ. *Strabo*, laudante Poole in loc.—Thus likewise the *Latin poet* says:

Illicet igne Jovis, lapsisq; citator astris,
Tristibus exiluit ripis.—

Stat. Theb. Lib. I.

antecedent

antecedent instead of the *relative*, or of the *substantive* instead of the *pronoun*, is likewise an idiom common to *The Hebrews*. We meet with an instance of this kind in the liiid Psalm, at the 2d verse: GOD *looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand, that did seek GOD h. e. himself*. And again, *Isaiah*, ch. xvi. ver. 7. *Therefore shall Moab bowl for Moab* ¹. In agreement with which mode of speech, the meaning of the present text is: That "JEHOVAH rained down *brimstone* and *fire* from *himself* out of heaven".

BUT, if any insist, that *these two angels* are to be considered as *the immediate instruments* in working this destruction [which may be allowed, both in a consistency with the above senses, and also with those which follow; there being nothing here, but what perfectly comports with their ministry;] it may be observ'd farther,

III. THIRDLY, That, as what *the principal* does by *his servants*, is said to be done by *the principal* himself; the meaning will then be: That "these angels, as *ministers* of JEHOVAH, "rained *brimstone* and *fire* from JEHOVAH, "their master, out of heaven". Which *brimstone* and *fire*, may therefore be said to be rained from JEHOVAH *himself*, because it was effected by *his instruments*. Once more,

¹ See also Gen. xxxv. 1. Exod. xxiv. 1. Hof. i. 7. and Zech. x. 12.

IV. FOURTHLY, AS THE MEDIATOR is THE SHEKINAH, or HABITATION, of THE one eternal JEHOVAH ; and therefore stands possessed not barely of his name, as it may signify a *delegated power* ; but also, as it signifies *the real presence, or indwelling*, of that true JEHOVAH ; So, when the text saith, that JEHOVAH rained *brimstone* and *fire* from JEHOVAH out of heaven ; it may intend : That “ THE MEDIATOR, having the above claim to the title of JEHOVAH, “ did HIMSELF, (as a specimen of his having “ *all judgment* committed into his hands) more “ immediately, rain *brimstone* and *fire* from “ JEHOVAH, THE FATHER, out of heaven ”. Because, we are to remember, that CHRIST, as MEDIATOR, was now in heaven ; having made his return thither, after he had finished his converse with *Abraham*, concerning the overthrow of *Sodom*, in the preceding chapter.

So that, whether we take any one, or all the above senses, into the explication of this passage ; it is very evident, that the work is, properly, the work of JEHOVAH himself ; understanding that term, principally, either of THE one GOD present in, and acting through THE MEDIATOR ; or of CHRIST himself, as THE ANGEL of the covenant, THE SHEKINAH, or HABITATION, of GOD ; who never acts, nor can act, alone, but always in immediate connexion with THE DIVINE BEING, or FATHER '. From whence it is again evident,

John. v. 19.

that

that the title, JEHOVAH, is not given, nor can be given with propriety, to any of the angels of what rank or order soever.

OR, keeping in more strict agreement with your lordship's manner of stating this affair; the amount of what has been here suggested may be put into this form of expression :

IT appears then from what has been said, that neither *two* of the three persons, who are called *men* in the xviiiith chapter, appearing to *Abraham* in the plains of *Mamre* ; nor *one*, out of the two, who are called *angels*, effecting the destruction of *Sodom* ; had the appellation of JEHOVAH given to them ; but one only of these three, even that person, who conversed with *Abraham*, and who, after he had done communing with him, departed to heaven : And who, both from the names that he bears, and from the work which he here came about ; appears to have been, not a created angel, but THE SHEKINAH or LOGOS. And therefore a person, who could not but have full right to the title of JEHOVAH : because the true, unchangeable JEHOVAH dwelt in him ; and, by that means, gave him a proper share in DIVINITY itself : Which will always be found a reason, sufficient to support his claim to that character ; to the eternal exclusion of every created angel, and therefore of *Michael*, their chief.

I CANNOT, however, intirely dismiss this subject, without taking the liberty to observe : That I either do not rightly understand your lordship,

lordship, or that I cannot see into the force of your reasoning ; when, in the close of the argument, you assert as follows : “ So that it is “ manifest, here are two distinct persons, or “ angels, which appeared upon earth, to each “ of which is given the appellation of *Jehovah*. “ *vab*”. For, were this true, the consequence of it is, that it must be destructive of your own scheme. Because, if there were two distinct persons, and these angels, each of them bearing the name of *JEHOVAH* ; I see not, what must become of *Michael’s* preference in the case. For, if two distinct angels, thus appearing, may have the appellation of *JEHOVAH* given to them, separately ; then, why may not each individual angel, through the whole species, be likewise intitled to this character ? That is to say : They may, as far as I see, be all *Michaels* or *Gabriels* ; all *Jehovahs* : especially, if charged with a commission obliging their appearance on our earth.—*Michael*, at least, must lose his pre-eminence.—How to reconcile this is submitted to your lordship.

THE NEXT scripture brought into the present service by your lordship, is, that, where THE ANGEL of GOD is said to have spoken to Jacob in a dream ; WHICH ANGEL, besides calling himself THE GOD of *Beth-el*¹, is, likewise, called by *Jacob* *JEHOVAH* his GOD². “ Whence” (to use your lordship’s own words) “ it is plain, that an Angel of God, speaking

¹ Gen. xxxi. 11, 13.

² Ibid, ch. xxviii. 21.

“ to *Jacob*, calls himself *Jehovah* the God of
 “ Bethel ”.

PARDON me, my lord, that I am free enough
 to declare, that I cannot enter on the particu-
 lars of this history, without expressing in this
 place, once for all (though there are frequent
 occasions for it) a very uncommon surprise at
 this one circumstance: Namely, “ That there
 “ should be writers of great learning and (ex-
 “ cept where a darling scheme is concern’d)
 “ of sound judgement and deep penetration;
 “ who can so thoroughly give themselves up
 “ to the influence of their own prejudices, as
 “ to determine to stifle all evidence against
 “ themselves, and make it their choice to be
 “ deceived !” For, surely, were not this the
 real fact, even with your lordship, in the pre-
 sent inquiry, you could never have prevailed
 on yourself: First of all, to have dismissed
 this part of *Jacob’s* history, described with
 great compass in different parts of the bible
 (particularly in the book of *Genesis*) by tran-
 scribing two passages only in the text, and
 barely referring to two more in the margin, of
The Essay. Nor, in the next place, could
 your lordship, otherwise, I imagine, have been
 satisfied with *the general principle*, on which
 you undertake to give the sense of these passa-
 ges of scripture: viz. That the person here
 called JEHOVAH must be a creature, and, in
 particular, *Michael*; because he is likewise
 called *an angel* in the context. Wherefore,

taking occasion from hence, I begin my remarks on this THIRD scripture, by observing,

I. FIRST, In reference to this *principle* itself; that it may with great ease be retorted on your lordship, as containing, within itself, an equal reason to the contrary of what your lordship has been pleased to assert. For there is just as much truth in saying, that the person, who is called *an angel* in these several texts, must be ALMIGHTY GOD, because he is called JEHOVAH; as there is in saying, that he must be a mere creature, because he is called by the name *angel*. So that, the whole of this being, what they call *arguing in a circle*, concludes equally on both sides; and therefore either proves nothing in itself, or proves as strongly against, as it can possibly do for, your lordship.—Not but the application of this character, JEHOVAH, to one before called *an angel* (provided we allow it it's proper effect) ought to raise in us, to say the least, a real suspicion, as was said above; that the person here appearing under this double character, must have something in him truly superior to every mere creature. And so much the more readily shall we be inclin'd to, and confirm'd in, the present conjecture, as there is room to observe,

II. THAT there is no proportion between the use of these two words, *angel* and JEHOVAH; or, at least, of *the lower and higher characters*,

acters, in the course of this history. For it will be instantly seen (by any, who will take the pains of turning to the several passages themselves) that the term *angel* occurs but *three times* in the representation of the present appearance: Namely, First, *Gen. xxxi. 11*, where the person is called *the angel* of God. Secondly, *ch. xlviii. 16*, where *Jacob* describes him in these terms: *The Angel, which redeemed me. &c.* And, thirdly, in the prophesy by *Hosea*, where speaking of *Jacob*, it is said: *He had power over the angel, &c. ch. xii. 4.* And so cautious is THE ALMIGHTY of his prerogative in this case, that he never suffers either *Jacob* or *Hosea*, to make use of this term [*angel*] without adding sufficient explication of it in the context; *viz.* by subjoining the word GOD, or JEHOVAH, in one or other of the preceding, or subsequent verses.—Besides those three places, in which this person is called *an angel*; he is once spoken-of by the name *man*: *Gen. xxxii. 24. And there wrestled a man with him, &c.* The like care being again taken in the context, to refer the whole transaction to THE ALMIGHTY, in the higher sense of the place.

WHEREFORE, on the other hand, agreeable to the observation last made, it will appear, when we come to inspect the account at large, as it stands described in the several texts refer'd to in the margin: That the word JEHOVAH is made use of seven times on the present
occa-

occasion¹; that of EL, five times²; ELOHE, as the singular, five times³; and ELOHIM, in the plural, no less than fifteen times⁴; making in the whole upwards of thirty. Whereas the lower characters used in this case, as we have seen above, occur only in four places. So that, if numbers may be allowed to determine in the present question, it is certain, that the balance of proof is greatly on our side.—But then, farther to demonstrate the interest, which THE ALMIGHTY has in this part of *Jacob's* history; I shall, in some following particulars, beg leave to examine more distinctly such of the characters, sustained by the person thus appearing, as are most to the purport of the present argument. And therefore,

III. I BEGIN with that passage by *Hosea*, ch. xii. ver. 4, 5. A passage, indeed, refer'd to by your lordship in support of your own hypothesis; but which, I imagine, when duly consider'd, will be found to militate strongly against it. The words are these: *He [Jacob] took his brother by the heel in the womb, and by his strength he had power with [ELOHIM] God. Yea, he had power over THE ANGEL, and prevailed: he wept and made supplication unto him: he found him in Beth-el and there he spake with*

¹ Gen. xxviii. 13, 16, 21. Ch. xxxi. 3. Hof. xii. 5.
² Gen. xxxi. 13. Ch. xxxv. 1, 3, 11. Ch. xlviii. 3. ³ Gen. xxviii. 13. Ch. xxxi. 5. Hof. xii. 5. ⁴ Gen. xxviii. 20, 22. Ch. xxxi. 7, 9. Ch. xxxii. 30. Ch. xxxv. 1, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15. Ch. xlviii. 15. Hof. xii. 3.

us. *Even* [JEHOVAH] THE LORD GOD of hosts. [JEHOVAH] THE LORD [a name chosen by himself for this purpose] is *his* [standing] memorial, in the church.

Now, to say nothing here as to the plural character ELOHIM, though it may, probably, be designed to give us an idea of THE GOD of revelation, not as A simple DIVINITY, but as dwelling in CHRIST; therefore insinuating the connexion between THE ONE GOD and THE ONE MEDIATOR: The one thing to be here principally attended, as rising to our present purpose, and therefore confirming the remark above; I mean, that as the character JEHOVAH is used on this occasion, so it justly leads us to suspect, that something more than a mere creature is concern'd: I repeat it; the one thing to be here principally observed, is, The information, which THE ALMIGHTY gives us by his prophet, concerning *the precise nature* of the person here call'd an angel. For, we have only to ask: Who, or what, was THIS ANGEL? And the text itself answers for us, not only by calling him ELOHIM; but by saying positively: *Even* JEHOVAH, THE GOD of hosts.—How then, will this scriptural explanation of the term [*angel*] comport with your lordship's doctrine on this head? What, a created angel, JEHOVAH, THE GOD of hosts! A mere creature, the one self-existent being; whose name therefore is I THAT AM¹, and *his* memorial [JEHOVAH] the incommunicable ti-

¹ See *Essay*, §. II.

tle! This, surely, can never be admitted, tho' your lordship were sole judge in the case. Because it is very evident, that you make that character, THE JEHOVAH *of hosts*, the peculiar of THE ONE GOD¹. But if so; the lest that can be infer'd from the present concession, is: That it cannot be supposed, this character is ever introduced, much less an active part assigned to it; unless we may, at the same time, be allowed to suppose, that THE ONE, eternal JEHOVAH is actually present, and personally concerned in the transaction itself. Not but, while your lordship, in the explication of this text, contends, that *a created angel*, and not THE JEHOVAH *of hosts*, is here concerned; it might likewise tempt us to ask: Whether the different parts of your lordship's doctrine on this subject really correspond.—But to return to the scriptural account of this character, which tells us, that THIS ANGEL is no less person than THE JEHOVAH *of hosts*: Must not this, my lord, utterly subvert, not only your general principle of interpretation, but likewise the interpretation itself? This, however, will still more fully appear, as I advance in the consideration of the other characters, under which THIS ANGEL rises to view in different parts of the history; particularly,

IV. WHERE he calls himself THE GOD of *Beth-el*². Now to acquaint ourselves fully in

¹ See *Essay*, §. lxxv, lxxvi.

² Gen. xxxi. 13, compared with ch. xxxv. 15, and ch. xlviii. 3.

the nature and quality of this person, who calls himself EL-BETH-EL, the following circumstances are to be observed : First,

On the part of G O D.

THAT as the person intended by this character, is no other than that GLORIOUS being, who appear'd to *Jacob* in his vision of *the ladder*, standing upon the earth and reaching up unto heaven ; it will be proper to consult, what we find deliver'd on that occasion, as necessary to instruct us on the present question ; and this we may take in the words of the sacred text : *And, behold ! JEHOVAH stood above it [b. e. the ladder] and said : I am JEHOVAH, THE GOD of Abraham thy father, and THE GOD of Isaac ; the land, whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed. And thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth : and thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south : and in thee, and in thy seed, shall all the families of the earth be blessed. And, behold ! I am with thee, and will keep thee in all places, whither thou goest ; and will bring thee again into this land. For I will not leave thee, until I have done that, which I have spoken to thee of¹.*

THE BLESSINGS here promised, though numerous, are perfectly distinct in the text itself, and therefore require no particular annumeration. The only questions to be asked on the occasion are such as these : Are not *the characters* here assumed by this person, and *the pro-*

¹ Gen. xxviii. 12—15.

mises here authoritatively made to *Jacob*, abundant proof, that THE ALMIGHTY himself was intimately concerned in the above manifestation? What are *the names*, by which we may certainly know THE DIVINE BEING? What are *the works*, that, undoubtedly, bespeak his real presence; if what we meet with, of both kinds, in this passage, are not of that sort? How could ALMIGHTY GOD himself have more fully described his gracious relation to the church; his paternal care of his people; his universal government and superintendency; than we find those things described in the present account? Wherefore, to deny the presence of THE DEITY on this occasion, and to refer both the characters and operations in the text, to a mere creature; what is it? but to sap the foundations of holy scripture; to bewilder the serious Christian, and even strip THE ALMIGHTY himself of his most distinguishing characters! These then are observables on the part of GOD. I go on therefore, secondly, to the consideration of other circumstances]

On the part of Jacob.

AND these follow from the 16th verse to the end of the chapter: *And Jacob awaked out of his sleep, and he said: Surely, JEHOVAH is in this place, and I knew it not. And he was afraid, and said: How dreadful is this place! This is none other but the house of GOD, and this is the gate of heaven. And Jacob rose up early in the morning, and took the stone, that he had put*

put for his pillow, and set it up for a pillar, and poured oil upon the top of it. And he called the name of that place Beth-el; but the name of that city [which was near the place, where he had lien] was called Luz at the first. And Jacob vowed a vow, saying: If GOD will be with me, and will keep me in this way, that I go; and will give me bread to eat, and raiment to put on; so that I come again to my father's house in peace: Then shall JEHOVAH be my GOD. And this stone, which I have set for a pillar, shall be GOD's house: and of all that thou shalt give me, I will, surely, give the tenth unto thee. Here then it is observable,

1. JACOB witness'd to the fullest conviction, that THE ALMIGHTY himself was really in that place; and that he was *principal* in this vision or manifestation. As a consequence of which we find,

2. THAT he not only entertained a most venerable opinion of the place itself; but was likewise filled with an holy dread, a religious fear of the DIVINE presence. From hence we observe,

3. THAT he immediately employed himself in the most solemn acts of devotion. Such, for example, as: First, *setting up the stone*, on which he had lien, for a pillar. As well to express his present gratitude to THE ALMIGHTY for the favour of this seasonable vision; as to preserve the memory of it through the future part of his life: That so, when he should, hereafter, return from his exile, he

might not only have it in his power to revisit the place itself; but likewise take occasion from thence to commemorate the DIVINE goodness on this agreeable spot. Add to this, secondly, his *pouring out oil* on this pillar: Which he did to intimate, that it was his pious intention, it should stand consecrated to the above glorious uses, both in reference to JEHOVAH and himself. And then, thirdly, his *vowing a vow*, or making a *most solemn protestation*, to the person, who had thus appear'd to him. In which it is easy to discover, that he not only makes profession of *that faith*; but also binds himself to *that practice*, which alone distinguish the true Christian. Because, in this vow, *Jacob*, besides acknowledging the person's right to divine worship, and throwing himself intirely upon his kind providence; farther promises those returns, which are due to none, but the DIVINE majesty himself: Namely, a full surrender of *his person* to him as JEHOVAH his GOD; and a voluntary tribute of the *tenths* of that substance, which he might graciously give him.

HERE then are not only *all the internal marks* of that holy reverence, which is the property of THE ONE GOD, the invisible and incomprehensible being; but also, *all the external marks* of divine homage, his present circumstances would admit of; paid to the person, who had indulged him this singular visit. From whence it is evident to a demonstration, that *Jacob* was thoroughly convinced, that the
 person,

person, who had now appeared to him, and made him these several extraordinary promises; was, by no means, any mere creature: But that THE GOD of *Beth-el* was absolutely THE GOD of *revelation*, that is, THE ALMIGHTY himself in CHRIST, as *that ladder* on which he himself stood, the supreme head of all his creatures; and by which medium heaven and earth are happily connected.

BUT the whole of this will receive additional evidence, when the history is farther examined, both on the part of GOD and on the part of *Jacob*; as it enlarges upon us by accounts in the xxxvth chapter of *Genesis*, ver. 1: *And GOD said unto Jacob: Arise, go up to Beth-el, and dwell there: and make there an altar unto GOD, that appeared unto thee, when thou fleddest from the face of Esau, thy brother.*

Now here it is to be observ'd: First,

On the part of GOD.

1. THAT he gave *Jacob* positive orders to remove to *Beth-el*. But we all know, that it is the province of ALMIGHTY GOD [and not of the archangel *Michael*] to determine the bounds of our habitations by his wise and sovereign providence; according to *Acts* xvii. 26. It is likewise observable,

2. THAT he commanded him to raise an altar to GOD at *Beth-el*, even to THAT GOD, who had several years since appeared to him there; an altar for the purposes of religious worship. Then, secondly,

On the part of Jacob :

IT is certain, in the general, that he was obedient to the DIVINE command as exhibited above. Particular proof of which is, that,

1. AFTER having purged his house of *all the strange gods*, they had amongst them (as a testimony of pious homage to THE true JEHOVAH) ver. 2 and 4 : *Jacob* and his family take their journey for *Luz*, that is, *Beth-el* ; according to accounts at the 6th verse. And then,

2. PURSUING his instructions from heaven, when he came to *Luz*, he not only built an altar for performing the solemn rites of sacrifice, ver 7 ; but, likewise, either repaired the pillar, he had before set-up at *Beth-el* ; or, as others suppose, erected a new one. Thus discharging the vow he had there made in his flight from *Canaan* : [*This stone, which I have set-up for a pillar, shall be GOD's house* ;] and celebrating the DIVINE goodness for a renewed visit, which JEHOVAH now, again, made him in this very place. Here then it may not be improper to ask :

1.) Can it be reasonably supposed, that *Jacob*, who was the servant of the true GOD, and one of the peculiar favourites of heaven, would have been left by THE ALMIGHTY to such a deception in the present case, as to have been suffer'd to take a mere creature for GOD himself? and to pay that homage to a mere creature, which was only due to himself, THE eter-

¹ Gen. xxviii. 22.

nal JEHOVAH? Would THE ALMIGHTY then suffer *Jacob*, in whom *all the families of the earth were to be blessed*¹; to fall into the grossest idolatry? and that, after he had been just *purging* his whole house *from idols*? For what less can it be than idolatry: First, to erect *an altar* to a mere creature, and then to pay DIVINE HOMAGE to such creature? — For, notwithstanding what your lordship is pleased to advance respecting *an angel's* claim to DIVINE WORSHIP, as *a minister* of God, and as clothed with *a delegated power* from God; asserting his right, in that capacity and under those qualifications, to *a degree* of worship, *proportionate to the power* he has in charge: Where, however, are the traces of this *qualified* homage to be met with in this history? Or, what are the religious acts here paid by *Jacob*, which suggest to us *an inferiority* of worship? Nay, farther, let it be shewn in this case, what he could have done more to THE most high God, that he has not actually done on the present occasion. But, if *the worship* is supreme; *the object* likewise is such: Or, at least, involves the real presence of THAT DIVINITY, which is only supreme. The one is an undeniable consequence of the other. But, if what has been now observed, be not sufficient to evince the truth of the premises; I have yet to remark farther:

2.) THAT *this altar*, which *Jacob* was to raise at *Beth-el*, and the worship, which he was to pay at this altar, were *the express dictates*

¹ Gen. xxviii. 14.

of JEHOVAH, himself; [for such is he called in the parallel text, *Gen. xxviii. 21*; and likewise by *Hosea*, as we have seen above ¹. What then, would THE LORD, even JEHOVAH himself, command *Jacob* to worship a creature? and to worship that creature under the notion of worship paid to himself? Would he then, substitute a creature in his own room, and order that creature to receive those acts of homage, which were only due to himself? For here, my lord, it must be observed, the evidence is full on the side of JEHOVAH, THE LORD. And therefore it can be *no salvo* to his glory, to represent: That *an angel* lays claim to a certain measure of DIVINE WORSHIP, not as *a creature*, but as one *invested with Authority* by ALMIGHTY GOD; or, that to treat *an angel* in this way, is not *idolatry*, because *such Adoration or Worship*, at last, returns to, and terminates in the one only and supreme God ². My reason for it is: That I cannot but apprehend, the distinction here made by your lordship, to be, indeed, destitute of all proper foundation. Because, on a principle of this kind, it will be either worship paid to a *power*, and not to a *person*; or to GOD himself, and not to the *angel*.

BESIDES that, a distinction of this sort, could it be established, would justify all the idolatry of the church of *Rome*, not barely with respect to the worship of *angels*; but also, for the worshiping of *images*: They telling us, that such

¹ Page 255.

² See *Essay*, §. LXXXV.

worship

worship is not paid to the image itself, but to the person represented by the image; ascending, again, as they pretend, through that person, to the DIVINE majesty himself. Here, therefore, a correspondence of doctrine is but too visible.

BUT, as the whole of this is contrary to facts, as they rise from the present context; whether we consider *the object* of Jacob's worship, or *the worship itself*: So, is it likewise contrary to *the nature* of the thing: It appearing, not only that the worship here commanded is *supreme*; but also, that it is worship commanded by JEHOVAH himself, and therefore *peculiar to him*, who is THE ONE, only living and true GOD. How your lordship will adjust these matters, I pretend not to determine. But, if what has been here offer'd be not subversive of your scheme, in this branch of it; we must then, of course, be thrown on the following manifest absurdity: *viz.* That *contraries* may be set-up with *equal truth* and *propriety*. But I go on,

V. To another character, by which Jacob describes the GREAT subject refer'd to in this part of the history, which is that, where he terms him: THE ANGEL, *which redeemed me from all evil*¹.

Now, fully to determine concerning *the nature and quality* of THIS ANGEL, we need

¹ Gen. xlviii. 16.

only inform ourselves in the following particulars :

1. WHO the person was, that *actually undertook* to be every thing to *Jacob*, and to do every thing for him, that his various circumstances should make necessary. And this, as we learn by accounts in the xxviiith chapter of *Genesis*, was no other than THE ALMIGHTY himself: He who was JEHOVAH; THE GOD of his fathers *Abraham* and *Isaac* ¹. Again,

2. LET it be farther inquir'd: WHO was that person, to whom *Jacob* himself *directly applied* for this general and perpetual preservation? And this, by subsequent accounts in that xxviiith chapter, we are sure, is the same JEHOVAH, who had appeared to him, standing above *the ladder* at *Luz*; and who had expressly charged himself with the care of *Jacob* through every condition of life ². Add to this,

3. THE EXPLICATIONS given by *Jacob* himself on this subject,

1.) TO his wives; chapter the xxxist: where the person, whom he calls *the angel* of GOD, at the 11th verse; he calls THE GOD of *Beth-el*, at the 13th.—Nor is this all: For he attributes to this person, as well *the increase* of his substance, when he came away, ver. 9; as *his support* during his twenty years hard servitude with *Laban*; ver. 7 and 38. And, speaking of his orders to return, it is observable, that the person, whom *Moses* here calls JE-

¹ Gen. xxviii. 13—15. See above, pag. 257, &c. ² Ver. 13.—16. and 20, 21.

HOVAH, ver. 3. [*And JEHOVAH said unto Jacob, Return, &c;*] the same person *Jacob* terms *THE GOD of my father*, verse 5; thus fully explaining this *latter* character to us, and making it the peculiar of *THE DIVINE BEING* himself.

2.) *THIS*, likewise, farther appears, when he comes to speak of *THE AUTHOR* of his deliverance to *Laban*, the Syrian: *Except THE GOD of my father, THE GOD of Abraham, and THE FEAR of Isaac, had been with me, surely, thou hadst sent me away now empty. GOD hath seen my affliction, and the labour of my hands, and rebuked thee yesternight* ¹. Subscribed to by *Laban* himself, in the account he gives of *GOD's speaking to him in a dream by night* ².

3.) *JACOB* is again found in the same confession, when he speaks of this affair to his household, after his return from *Padan-aram*. His words are these: *Let us arise, and go up to Beth-el, and I will make there an altar unto GOD, who answered me in the day of my distress, and was with me in the way, which I went* ³. Once more,

4.) *WHEN* he gave *Joseph* a relation of this fact, not long before his death, it was done in the following terms: *And Jacob said unto Joseph, GOD ALMIGHTY appeared unto me at Luz in the land of Canaan, and blessed me* ⁴. And again, verses 15 and 16: *And he [Jacob]*

¹ Gen. xxxi. 42.
pared.
ch. xlviii. 3.

² Ibid. ver. 24 and 29. compared.
³ Ibid. ch. xxxv. 3.

⁴ Ibid.

blessed

blessed Joseph, and said, GOD, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, THE GOD, which fed me all my life long unto this day, THE ANGEL, which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads, &c. For when these two verses are compared, it is evident, that the characters explain themselves. Because the person, whom *Jacob* calls *THE ANGEL*, which *redeemed me*, at the 16th verse; is apparently the same with the person, whom he calls *THE GOD of his fathers*, at the 15th verse. Which title [*THE GOD of his father Isaac, or THE GOD of his fathers, Abraham and Isaac*] is peculiarly appropriate to *THE ONE*, eternal *JEHOVAH*; as I have shewn above, by comparing these terms, in the reciprocal use made of them by *Jacob* and *Moses*, chap. xxxi. 3, 5, 7, &c.¹

So that, when all these accounts are put together, it is no difficult matter to judge concerning the present character: I mean, who, *THIS* redeeming *ANGEL* was, in the opinion of *Jacob*. Because it appears throughout, that he ever looked upon him as a *DIVINE* personage, *THE ALMIGHTY* himself.—And, with regard to the sentiments of *The Jews* in this case, as well ancient as modern, I have before observed: That they always considered this character, *THE* redeeming *ANGEL*, as including those glorious particulars, which can never be accommodated to any mere creature whatever.

BUT, after having thus allowed *THE ALMIGHTY* himself full property in this charac-

¹ See above, p. 266.

ter,

ter, let us not forget, who, or what THE ALMIGHTY GOD is (agreeable to former hints) on the exhibitions of scripture: Namely, not a mere, simple DIVINE ESSENCE; not THE ONE, supreme BEING under his bare character of *natural dominion*; not AN eternal, absolute SPIRIT, *dwelling in the light unto which no man can approach*¹: But THAT DEITY, collecting himself into a branch of our own nature, even into THE MAN, CHRIST: Thus throwing the veil of CHRIST's *humanity* over his own infinite, essential glories. — And this, I am inclined to think, is the very thing we are to infer, from *Jacob's* being led to close his account of this DIVINE personage, when blessing his grandsons, by that character, THE ANGEL *that redeemed me*. Because, as we see in the preceding character, which is that of GOD ALMIGHTY, a most illustrious and awful idea of THE ONE, underrived, omnipotent BEING; it is certain, had the representation stop'd here, we had been precluded a true, and therefore an encouraging view of THE FIRST CAUSE, as he shines forth in the MEDIATORIAL system. For, in the former light, what had we seen of THE ONE supreme GOD? The answer is: Barely a display of him, either in his *own essential power*; or in his mere, *natural relation* to mankind. Whereas, subjoining the other character; *viz.* THE ANGEL *which reedemed me*, &c. it evidently brings the description down to the MEDIATORIAL person, even THE ANGEL *of the*

¹ 1 Tim. vi. 16.

covenant; and therefore points out this God ALMIGHTY, both as residing *in him* and coming forth *through him*, in all his appearances to *Jacob*, and all the provisions he made for him. The consequence of which is: That as THE DIVINE and MEDIATORIAL BEINGS stand inseparably *connected*, but not *confounded*, in their persons; so, we shall always find sufficient intimations in the texts themselves, leading us to conclude, that they act in *perpetual concert*: And that neither *appearances* of the present kind, nor any *transactions* whatever, can be justly explained, unless we admit this mutual alliance and intercourse.— We may remember, JEHOVAH and *the ladder*, which in it's spiritual reference is CHRIST, stood connected under a preceding particular. But then,

VI. THERE remains yet another character, and that of the inferior class, which it is proper, I should take notice of, as standing in connexion with this part of *Jacob's* history: Namely, what we meet with in the xxxi^d chapter of *Genesis*, ver. 24, where we have this account: *And there wrestled a man with him until the breaking of the day.*

WHO this person, here called *a man*, was, is the only question. Nor need we look far, I imagine, for a direct answer; if we only take *the character* and *office* of CHRIST into the account, and will allow scripture to be it's *own interpreter*. For, on these principles, we shall

shall soon be convinced, that the person here called *a man*, was no other than THE MAN CHRIST, or THE MEDIATOR, in his pre-existent spirit; assuming, for the present occasion, the appearance of *a man*, and taking a body, as well suitable to that appearance, as to the combat, in which he was to engage with *Jacob*.

HERE then, looking no farther back than the preceding head, and comparing it with this; we shall readily collect proper matter for illustrating the remark made above, at page 220, namely: That, in some of these histories, the character is principally taken from *the humanity*; and, in others, that it depends chiefly on THE DIVINITY. For as, in the examination of the foregoing scripture, THE ALMIGHTY himself seems to bear the chief external figure [though uniting with himself the MEDIATORIAL person in his appearances to *Jacob* ;] so here, it is evident, that the character is principally drawn from *the humanity*; or, that it immediately turns on CHRIST, THE MEDIATOR.

WHAT then have we to do in the case? Only to remember, that there is a perpetual and unalterable connexion between the DIVINE and MEDIATORIAL persons. So that, whether THE DEITY be spoken of principally, it is still GOD in CHRIST; or, whether *the humanity* be spoken of principally, it is still THE MAN in GOD.

BUT,

BUT, as to the account now before us, there is evidently this good reason to be given, for the character's being taken from *the humanity*: Namely, that a *bodily conflict*, between *Jacob* and THIS MAN, was to attend the present appearance. Wherefore it was necessary, that the description should turn principally on the MEDIATORIAL person, as a branch of human nature: And as such, both personally distinct from THE DIVINE BEING, and in a condition, not only of *being sent* in the proper sense of the word; but also of sustaining all *lower* characters, whether it be that of *man*, as in this; or that of *angel*, in other passages of scripture.

NOR is this all; for we have here again a farther opportunity of observing: That let the description open, as it will; meaning, whether with the DIVINE character, as in some places; or with *the human*, as in others: Yet the account never terminates, without bringing down the higher character to the MEDIATORIAL person; and, on the other hand, carrying the lower character up to the DIVINE person. Therefore, at once, illustrating and confirming the mutual connexion, which there is between GOD and CHRIST; and proving to a demonstration, that as neither can be equally described, but where this connexion is preserved: So that, THE ALMIGHTY never gives forth any declarations, either concerning himself, as THE GOD of *revelation*; or concerning CHRIST, as *his tabernacle* and *throne*; but where

where this mutual connexion is preserved and inculcated, as that grand key, by which the contents of sacred scripture are only to be unlock'd.

BUT it will be ask'd: What are the instances of this superior, DIVINE reference in the history before us? Or, in other words, How does it appear, that the person, who at this time wrestled with *Jacob*, and who is here, in our entrance on this subject, expressly called *a man* [How does it appear, that this person] bore any proper reference to, or had any personal connexion with, THE DIVINE BEING? To this I answer:

THAT, notwithstanding it was, at first, doubtful to *Jacob*, who this person was [as well because *angels* sometimes took the appearances of men, as because *the day was not yet broke* ;] for example: Whether a friend or an enemy; whether one sent from heaven to aid him, or one detached from his brother *Esau* to surprize him: Yet, it appears from the several particulars of this history, that, before they parted, *Jacob* was so well acquainted with the true nature of this person, as to be thoroughly assured, he was neither *a mere man*, nor *any created angel*. The circumstances, which I refer to, in support of the present assertion are such as these:

1. THAT *Jacob* insisted on the favour of *a blessing* from him, ver. 26; and was accordingly honour'd with it, ver. 29.

S

2. THAT

2. THAT this person in his own right, or by a power truly his own, *changed* the patriarch's name from *Jacob* to that of *Israel*.—Now, it is certain, that both the *authoritative blessing* above, and the *changing his name* here ; are the known prerogatives of the DIVINE majesty ; being therefore expressly ascrib'd to him at the 9th and 10th verses of the xxxvth chapter of *Genesis*. So that, as both these acts take place on the present occasion, we have, undoubtedly, just ground to infer the interposition of THE DEITY. Again,

3. It appears by *Hosea's* relation of this history, that Jacob *wept* and *made supplication* to the person, with whom he now wrestled, ch. xii. 4. Herein representing this contest, as attended with an instance of devotion equally humble and fervent. It is, therefore, from hence very observable, that *Jacob* was fully convinced of *the ability* of this person to assist him in, and carry him through, his present extraordinary difficulties. But with whom does a view of this kind comport, if we preclude THE GODHEAD ; or allow THE DIVINE BEING no positive concern in the expected deliverance ?

BESIDES, as there is here a most solemn act of devotion, who but God, in the proper sense of the word, could be the object of it ? Or, rather, in other terms : What but *the presence* of true and supreme DIVINITY, can either lay a foundation for such worship, or justify the performance of it ? For, as to a *voluntary*

luntary humility and worshiping of angels; which, as your lordship intimates¹, is a worshiping of them *out of our own head*, and without any scriptural warrant for the practice; we all know it, to be a thing strictly forbidden by the doctrine of the new testament². So that, as *Jacob*, on the present occasion, appears to have been engaged in as fervent an act of *supplication*, as the heart can pour forth; we can be positive that the person, who has alone a true claim to it, can be no other than GOD, or CHRIST: And, therefore, CHRIST, either because he is THE ONE MEDIATOR *between* GOD and *men*; or, because he involves SUPREME DIVINITY to the metaphysical structure of his person: [Which means, that THE FULNESS OF THE GODHEAD, or the ONE GOD himself, without confounding their persons, *dwels bodily* in THE MAN, CHRIST.] But in this view of things, we stand possess'd both of *the prime object*, and *the alone medium* of all religious homage, supposing it performed in *the most punctual manner*; tho', it is certain, that order is not always observed. However, *Jacob* having now BOTH of them before him, and being, by the nature of all DIVINE homage, absolutely confined to one, or other of these persons, as *the object* of his present addresses; the only conclusion left us from the premises, is: That he could, by no means, be now *making supplication* to a mere creature;

¹ §. lxxxv.² Col. ii. 18.

but, on the contrary, either to THE ALMIGHTY himself as dwelling in CHRIST, or to CHRIST, as dwelling in God. Be the strict, *personal* reference, however, as it will; *the actual presence* of TRUE DEITY must be included. Which is yet farther evident,

4. IN the last place, by the solemn profession, which *Jacob* makes, on this occasion, respecting *the nature* of the person, with whom he had been wrestling; it being from hence evident, that he looked upon him, as one infinitely superior to every mere creature, whether *man* or *angel*. To this purpose is what he saith at the 30th verse: *And Jacob called the name of the place Peniel: for [as the reason of giving it this name, saith he] I have seen God face to face.* What! a god *by office*? A creature, with a certain degree of *delegated power*? Let *Hosea* answer for us, as above. By no means: But JEHOVAH, THE GOD of *hosts*¹: That same person, who appeared to him again, after this vision, on his removing to *Beth-el*.

THIS, therefore, is full proof, that THE ONE supreme GOD was now actually on the spot; and, consequently, that the history, in it's different parts, makes full provision, both for the support of the higher character, as it must include DEITY; and for the explication of the lower, as founded in *the humanity* of CHRIST: And, therefore, as well for the connexion of them in all these appearances,

¹ Ch. xii, ver. 5.

as for the interchangeable use of them in other parts of revelation.

THIS then may be called *the scriptural state* of the present history ; such, I would hope, as may be justly term'd, clear and familiar. However, if farther evidence be thought necessary, in, what may be rather called, *the argumentative way* ; I have to observe, that it readily opens upon us, both on the part of THE MEDIATOR, and also, on the part of THE DIVINE BEING.

I. SUPPOSING then, as hath been already allowed, that THE MEDIATOR is the person here more immediately refer'd to ; the sole question is : Who is THE ONE MEDIATOR between GOD and *men* ? Not *an angel*, but *a man* ; as I have proved above : Yet, not *a mere man* ; meaning, *a man*, at that distance from THE DIVINE BEING, in his metaphysical nature, at which we, the other branches of the human species, avowedly stand. The reason of which is, that the text expressly declares : *It pleased ALL FULLNESS* (which can be nothing less than GOD himself, because he only fills all in all ; *it pleased ALL FULLNESS*) *to dwell in him* ¹. And, again, more particularly, as to *the manner* of this inhabitation, it saith : *IN HIM dwelleth all the fulness of THE GODHEAD bodily* ² ; that is, I apprehend, *really, personally, or substantially* : Or, yet farther, in such sort, that this individual branch of the human nature is in quality

¹ Col. i. 19.

² Ibid. ch. ii. 9.

of a temple to THE DEITY ; THE HABITATION, seat or throne, of THE ONE GOD.

BUT if ALL THE DIVINE FULNESS, *personally* consider'd [for this is spoken of THE DIVINE ESSENCE, and not merely of *divine gifts*] reside thus in THE MAN, CHRIST ; what other reason want we to convince us, that *the tabernacle itself* must needs share in the glory of the DIVINE inhabitant ? For, can it ever be imagin'd, that THE ALMIGHTY can in this manner collect himself into the person of CHRIST ; and yet, that true and proper DIVINITY is not *predicable* of that branch of our nature, in which God himself *personally*, or *essentially* resides ? [And this, without infringing either on THE DIVINITY of THE ONE GOD, or withdrawing from *the humanity* of CHRIST, abstractly considered.] Not to allow this reasoning, would be full as just as to say : That tho' *the material sun* were cas'd round with a ball of *crystal*, and consequently emitted all it's rays through that medium ; yet, that there was not the least connexion between *the sun* and this globe of *crystal* ; but, on the contrary, that it was alike destitute both of light and heat : When, at the same time we cannot but know, that the real fact, on the present supposition, would be ; that *this crystal case* is so intirely lost in it's splendor, as to wear *the appearance*, and therefore challenge *the name* of the sun itself.

BUT, if THE MAN, CHRIST, be in this manner God's fellow, as really partaking in his nature ;

ture; I mean, as involving DIVINITY to the true metaphysical structure of his person: And if, besides this, he sustain the character of THE ONE MEDIATOR between GOD and *men*; or be the alone medium, through which THE DIVINE BEING vouchsafes all discoveries of his person, and all displays of his goodness and power, both in nature and grace; see we not plainly, on what solid grounds, he may be consider'd as *the object* of prayer? and may likewise be allowed to dispense *all kinds of blessings* directly from himself? See we not plainly, on what just principles, he may be supposed to challenge a right, not only *to change the name* of any of his creatures; but also to claim interest himself in *all the names* of THAT GOD, who thus resides in him, and therefore makes him one with himself in all external displays and operations? — Thus then OUR blessed SAVIOUR, both as THE SON of GOD [for the person *precedes* his office;] and as MEDIATOR, appears to stand possess'd of every qualification, *natural* and *delegated*, that may justify us in applying the several circumstances in this history to him. And then farther,

2. As to the other view of the question, which points more directly to THE DIVINE BEING or FATHER: Has it not been shewn, that THE GOD of *revelation*, is GOD *manifest in the flesh*? That there is an inviolable connexion between the DIVINE and MEDIATORIAL persons? And therefore that, where CHRIST,

~~THE~~ MEDIATOR, appears; there GOD himself is found likewise, even to the constitution of his person, as well as the support and exercise of his office? Wherefore, taking THE FATHER, or ONE GOD, into the account (and it is of necessity, that we thus take him, for the reasons now given;) none will dispute his right *to bless*. It will also be granted, that he *has changed*, and that he *may change*, the names of his creatures, whenever he pleases. And, again, farther: It will likewise be allowed, that he is *the object* of prayer; nay, *the supreme object*. And, lastly, that he has true and proper right, and that in the highest sense of the terms, to *all* DIVINE names, titles, attributes, &c.

THE only addition then to be made to this account [or, as it may, possibly, be better express'd, *the only circumstance*, which it is necessary we bear in mind] for our conceiving of these several things in a manner agreeable to holy scripture, and therefore in a manner worthy the DIVINE and MEDIATORIAL beings; and again, in such sort, as to render them agreeable to ourselves, is this: Namely, That GOD *dwels* in CHRIST: Being therefore, first, A FATHER to him, *for love*; and, secondly, A SPIRIT within him, *for divine influence*: And then, in and through this medium, manifesting himself, in both these characters, as truly and fully, to his church under the present dispensation; as he did by *these personal visits*, in and through CHRIST, to certain peculiar

culiar favourites under the preceding. For this we shall always find, if we examine *revelation* through, and particularly OUR LORD'S OWN doctrine; that THE DIVINE BEING ever sustains the same characters towards CHRIST, which he does towards the real Christian: But then, it is true, in a sense, that admits of *no comparison*. Because there is, there can be, no proportion, between *receiving* THE SPIRIT *without measure* ; which is the case with CHRIST, by virtue of THE indwelling GOD-HEAD; and *receiving only a pittance* of it, which is the case with us, as members of his body. However, as THE DIVINE BEING, in and through CHRIST, certainly sustains both these characters to the true Christian; so every such person is made acquainted with him in both these characters, in a degree suitable to his rank in the divine life.

NOR can it be doubted, but that as *Jacob*, in the other parts of his history, still keeps THE DIVINE BEING in view, as *the supreme efficient* in all the deliverances, he shared; and in all the provisions, he enjoy'd: So, that he here, likewise, takes cognizance of him in the same point of light; and therefore considers him as actually present in, and strictly operative thro', THAT MAN, with whom he was now contending: Whether he conceived in a perfectly clear and full manner of the MEDIATORIAL person, or not.

HAVING then this second state of the argument before us, we cannot but be immediately convinced of these two things:

FIRST, That the character, in this history, evidently rises from *humanity* to DIVINITY; as, in some others, it opens with DIVINITY and descends to *humanity*. In consequence of which, we shall want no proof, that, though the DIVINE and MEDIATORIAL beings are always to be *carefully distinguished*, as to their ABSTRACT natures; yet they are never to be *totally separated* either in any one operation, or any one appearance. But this being fact, it shews us,

SECONDLY, That we have no one principle, by which to account for this real and personal attendance of THE DIVINE BEING on this, and other, innumerable occasions; but that already suggested: Namely, that it has pleased ALMIGHTY GOD to make choice of THE MAN, CHRIST, both as *his sole tabernacle* of residence, and *his only medium* of appearance and operation. A consideration, I apprehend, which gives us the first true light, both of *the nature* of CHRIST's person, and his interest in all DIVINE titles, &c.

NOW from the former of these heads, which leads us to conclude, that THE DIVINE BEING bears part with CHRIST in all those services, which he has charged himself with as MEDIATOR; and therefore in these occasional appearances among the rest; I am led

VII. To the last thing, I have to propose, whether in reference to the history of *Jacob*, or any other descriptions of the like kind ; it being, what I may call *a review* of the *angelical* character : And it is therefore here reas-
sumed, because, in consequence of the hint refer'd to above, it seems to promise something *additional*, to what has been yet strictly observed in the explication of these passages.

Now the remark, which I have here to make, indulging a freedom of expression, may be this : What if ALMIGHTY GOD, in and by HIS SHEKINAH, condescend to take the appearance, and act the part of *an angel* or *messenger* ; shall he not then be properly called by *that name*, without infringing on his true nature, his essential glory ? Let the dispensation, under which these things were transacted, be thoroughly consider'd ; and then it will readily be seen, that what ALMIGHTY GOD was afterwards pleased to effect by HIS SPIRIT [I am now speaking of the conveyance of divine knowledge ; what he was pleased to effect by HIS SPIRIT] that is, by a divine impulse from himself, irradiating the minds of the prophets ; he was condescending enough to effect *in his own person* for the dispensation now refer'd to : Therefore manifesting himself, in a visible manner, in the form of *an angel*, or even that of *a man*, as one *sent*, or *coming down* from heaven. And thus it is, that we may consider him, as making the necessary discoveries of
his

his mind to *Adam, Enoch, and all the patriarchs*, as well before, as after the flood.

WHEREFORE, as was said above, if ALMIGHTY GOD, in and through HIS SHEKINAH (as they are never to be separated) was thus pleased to take upon himself the form and office of *an angel*; why may he not, in reference to these appearances, and on the foot of such ministrations, be spoken of under the character of *an angel*, as well as CHRIST himself, THE MEDIATOR; or even any of the angels, properly so called? This being confessedly a name of *office*, and not of *nature*; or, at least, not of *nature*, exclusive of *office*.

AND with this principle (so far as it pleads for the *real presence* of DEITY itself) thoroughly agrees an observation made by *Maimonides* * on the 3d verse of the xxxist chapter of *Genesis*; which is: That THE DIVINE BEING, in his intercourse with the most distinguished persons of the old-testament church; did not confine himself to *one manner* of communication: But besides making use of *dreams* and *visions*, and the ministry of *an angel*; he is likewise said, in some cases, to have spoken *absolutely*, that is, neither by dream, nor vision, nor angel; but *by himself*, or *in his own person*; an instance of which, he supposes, we have in the passage above †.

* *More Nevochim*, P. II. cap. 42. Laudante Patrick in Gen. xxxv. 1.

† To which may be added those of Gen. iii. 8—21. and ch. xii. 1. and xxxv. 9, with many others.

IN concurrence with which sentiment, I have the pleasure of adding a parallel testimony from Bishop *Patrick*, in his commentaries on the 1st verse of the xxxvth chapter of *Genesis*; where he has these words, speaking of *Maimonides*: “ In which *Classis*, I think he “ might have put this Apparition to *Jacob*, as “ well as that last mentioned: For there is no “ difference between them, but this: That “ in the former place (xxx. 3.) it is said, “ *The LORD said unto Jacob*; and here, *GOD “ said unto Jacob*”.

As it then appears from the representations just made, that there wants not good reason for the application of the *angelical* character even to THE DIVINE BEING himself: So, I must not neglect the opportunity which here offers, of introducing this *farther* remark concerning THE MEDIATOR: Namely, that for as much as he stands represented in these appearances both as *a man* and as *an angel*; it is certain, the explication of these two characters will be found *much more natural*, on supposition of CHRIST's being a branch of the human species [because it immediately and fully accounts for his being call'd *man*; the side, on which the chief difficulty lies:] than it can be pretended, on supposition of his being an angelical or super-angelical nature. Because it is easy to conceive, how a person, who is *a true man*, may, on account of *office*, be justly stiled *an angel*. While, on the other hand, the propriety, in calling one, who is in fact of the *angelical*

angelical species, by the name man ; is, by no means, either so evident or certain. Because we have nothing to support an application of this kind, but that of having recourse to a figurative manner of speech.

As to the two passages of scripture, which come next into view ¹; the former relating THE LORD's appearance to Moses in a flame of fire out of the bush ², and the other his going before the camp of Israel in a pillar of a cloud by day, and in a pillar of fire by night ³; on both which occasions the two characters now under consideration [*b. e.* JEHOVAH and THE ANGEL of GOD] are observed to occur: They admit of a very easy interpretation on the principle already laid down: the lower character [*angel*] supposing we understand it in a strict sense, being plainly referable to CHRIST, as a branch of the human nature charged with *office*; and the higher [JEHOVAH] demanding the like reference to THE ALMIGHTY himself, on the plan of revelation: By which means THE DIVINE BEING and CHRIST, HIS SHEKINAH, are still kept in close and inseparable connexion.

BUT, tho' the above principle be in itself all, that is necessary to account for the reciprocal use of those characters, ANGEL and JEHOVAH, on the present occasion; [and, as intimated before, is, indeed, the only true principle, on which this interchangeable use of

¹ 5. lviii, lix.

² Exod. iii, 2.

³ Ibid. ch. xiv. 19.

them,

them, together with all appearances of this kind, can be accounted for in a consistency with the MEDIATORIAL scheme ;] yet, farther to strengthen this principle, especially in that part of it, which supposes *the actual presence* of THE eternal JEHOVAH, or the ONE GOD himself, in this, and the like apparitions ; there is a circumstance or two in the account, which highly deserves our attention. For example :

I. THAT, as the person here appearing to *Moses*, takes to himself the appellation of the eternal JEHOVAH, in the fullest as well as THE most simple manner, saying positively, that he is that being, whose name is I THAT AM ; denoting *self-existence* in the strongest sense of the word : I repeat it : This being observable in respect to *the title*, by which this person here calls himself ; the unavoidable conclusion is : That it will for ever be impossible for us to know, when we are either hearing from, or treating with, the SUPREME BEING himself ; if we may not be allowed to suppose, that he is here actually present, and personally concerned in, and with THIS ANGEL ; supposing him *an inferior nature*, in his thorough remove from THE DEITY. Or, to express it in a more general manner : If any created being, merely on the score of *delegated power*, may say, that he is THE eternal and immutable I AM ; we cannot be sure that THE ONE, self-existent BEING ever speaks to us through the whole course of OUR BIBLE.

II. THE

II. THE OTHER thing, that I have to observe in farther proof of *the real presence* of THE DEITY itself on this occasion, is : That, I imagine, it will be impossible for the most acute writer to point out to us any, the least indication of a *subordinate worship* in this place. —For what greater effect could the DIVINE presence itself have had *upon the ground*, on which *Moses* stood ? It being expressly said, on this very account, to be *holy*. Or, what greater instance of reverence, consistent with the present interview, could the majesty of heaven have requir'd, had he been upon the spot ? *Moses* being order'd to receive his commands *bare-footed*. Do not then all circumstances, so far as the nature of the thing [by which I mean especially, *Moses* being in a *posture*, proper to receive the DIVINE commands, so far as the nature of the thing] will admit, jointly conspire to assure us : That, notwithstanding the person, here, speaking to him, is called AN ANGEL, on account of the ministerial part he was here acting ; yet, that a much greater, than any *created* angel, is now present ?

AND what is your lordship's exception to this state of the case ? Merely, that the same person, who here calls himself I THAT AM, is elsewhere called *an angel*. An argument, which, as has been observed above, I must beg leave to say, proves nothing ; because it is absolutely *equivocal* : What I mean is, suits

⌚ See page 198 and 252.

each side of the question equally; shewing therefore that, on this principle, the person here intended, has the same right to be considered as THE TRUE JEHOVAH, that he has to be called AN ANGEL: Because each name is given to him indifferently. But, though this way of reasoning proves nothing, as to the *metaphysical* nature of the person; the fact, however, is certain: And the appeal is, whether there can be any better method of accounting for it, than that already suggested: Namely, that we have here an higher and lower nature, and infinite and a finite spirit, mutually concerned. In consequence of which, we are naturally thrown on that common principle of interpretation advanced above: *viz.* That there is a strict connexion between the persons of the DIVINE and MEDIATORIAL beings,

AND thus farther, as to the latter of these texts, that is to say: *The pillar of cloud* and *the pillar of fire*; I might, for the fuller illustration of the subject, observe:

I. IN the first place, that the things themselves, which are here made *the emblems* of God's real presence among *The Israelites*, precisely point out, in their very composition or structure, the *united* residence, I am now asserting: It being evident, that *the fire* is admirably designed to represent the presence of THE DEITY; while *the cloud*, on the other hand, expresses, in a very lively manner, *the*
T
humanity,

humanity, or veil of CHRIST's flesh: ALMIGHTY GOD, by this instrument, still going on to give us a distinct view of the condescending method, he hath taken to accommodate himself to the broken circumstances of his creatures. And therefore, we find, that *this cloud* was still retained as a mark of the DIVINE presence in the temple at *Jerusalem*, resting over the propitiatory; or, above, between the cherubims, which adhered to the propitiatory: Not *a fire* merely, which had only expressed the dreadful majesty of AN absolute GOD; but *a fire* intermixt with, and allay'd by, *a cloud* or kind of *mist*; to signify, as before, that this tremendous majesty hath fixed *his tabernacle* in a branch of the human nature. Again,

II. I MIGHT likewise farther remark, that the testimonies of holy scripture, in reference to the real presence of JEHOVAH in *this pillar*, are both so full and so numerous; that, I question, whether there be any one fact in THE whole BIBLE either more strongly, or more frequently asserted, than this: I mean, that JEHOVAH himself did actually reside in *this cloud*; that he journey'd with *The Israelites*, by this visible token; that he attended the *Mosaic tabernacle* in this form, and conversed with *Moses*, on particular occasions, through *this medium*.

So that to refer either *the presence* in *this pillar*; *the movements* of it for the conduct of *The Israelites*; or *the other uses*, that were made of it, whether at first in the wilderness, or afterwards

terwards in the temple of *Solomon*; to the confidence and direction of any one created angel, tho' it were *Michael* himself: I am obliged to say, is greatly to abuse, not the holy scriptures only, but even THAT GOD, whose oracles they are.

WITH regard to the several passages of scripture in *The following section* ¹, which treat of *Moses*' going up to mount *Sinai*, and of his conversing there with JEHOVAH, and receiving instructions from him to prepare the whole camp against his appearing on the mount, for giving forth *the law* in a formal, majestic manner; the evidence arising from the bare recital of the texts themselves, as here given us by your lordship, makes, in my humble opinion, so strongly against you; the whole account being giving forth, either by JEHOVAH himself, or in the express name of JEHOVAH; and that term occurring no less than *nine times* in the context: I beg leave to repeat it: The whole of this account makes so strongly against your lordship in the present case; that I cannot but wonder, you could find no expedient for adjusting the contents of these places, with such other passages, relative to this subject, as you have quoted from the new testament; without striking out the real presence of JEHOVAH himself, and making the whole centre in the ministry of *an angel*, exclusive of JEHOVAH. Because, if this be not your lordship's design, to what purpose are the quotations introduc'd?

¹ *Essay*, §. 1x.

BUT to look more particularly into the new testament state of this affair. "St. Stephen," saith your lordship, "who was a Jew, affirms, "that *the law* was given by the disposition of "ANGELS¹".

I. HERE the first question is: *What Law* was this? Not the intire body of the *Jewish* law; those branches of it, which are called *judicial* and *ceremonial*, making the far greater part of their law, being excepted. For every thing of this kind was delivered immediately by GOD, *b. e.* by GOD in CHRIST, to *Moses* himself; attending, for this purpose, *forty days* and *forty nights* in the mount². *The Law* therefore here peculiarly refer'd to, is that, which is called *moral*, contained in *two tables of stone*, written with the finger of GOD³; exhibiting a summary view of their duty in *religious* and *social life*; or, in other terms, their *moral* obligations to GOD, themselves and their neighbours. Having then settled this point, by which we are perfectly informed in the nature of *the law* here refer'd to; the next inquiry is

II. WHAT account have we, from the text, concerning the promulgation of this law?—That it was given *by the disposition of ANGELS*.——Undoubtedly true (as I have elsewhere observ'd) in respect of what was *purely mecha-*

¹ Acts vii. 53.
ch. xxxi. 18.

² Exod. xxiv. 18.

³ Ibid.

nical in the present ceremony : It being certain, that neither THE ALMIGHTY, nor CHRIST, concerned themselves personally in forming the *audible sound of words* ; or, in raising that solemn apparatus of *blackness* and *darkness* and *tempest*, made use of at this time ¹. And what was the necessity they should ? when they had thousands, and ten thousands of *holy angels* ², their ministers, now present to effect this tremendous machinery for them. But, with submission, does the attendance and ministry of *the angels*, on this occasion, preclude the actual descent, and real presence, either of JEHOVAH or CHRIST ? What business had *the angels* here, except it were to attend THEIR SOVEREIGN, and by the above awful process proclaim his immediate presence ? These, we are sensible, are merely the retinue of ALMIGHTY GOD, and therefore where we find the herald, we may reasonably suppose, the prince himself is at hand. Not but to dispute a fact of this kind, is absolutely to contradict repeated, express testimony of scripture ; and this, to go no farther, even as it rises to us from the several passages here transcribed by your lordship ; agreeable to a hint given in our entrance on *this section*.

BUT this is not all : For St. *Stephen*, according to your lordship, says, it was “ AN ANGEL, *that spake to Moses from mount Sinai,* “ *and with our fathers, who received the lively*

¹ Heb. xii. 18, 19, compared with Exod. xx. 18. ² Deut. xxxiii. 2. Vide *Mede* in loc. B. II. p. 344.

“ oracles to give unto us¹ ”. Now here, my lord, with submission, I would

I. IN the first place, take the liberty of making a small emendation in the text itself, as you have been pleased to quote it. Because we shall find, on turning to the place, that St. *Stephen* was far from allowing himself this general mode of expression; but, instead of saying AN ANGEL, which is *any angel*, at large (and therefore, in short, might preclude even *Michael* himself;) he puts it *emphatically*, and says, THE ANGEL. But this gives the person a mark of distinction. It was not therefore *any common, any created angel*, which he had in view; but CHRIST, THE ANGEL of the covenant: THAT particular ANGEL, who appeared to *Moses* in a flame of fire out of the bush²; and who, principally on account of THE indwelling GODHEAD, is afterwards called THE LORD, and THE GOD of *Abraham*, &c, ver. 31—34.—Such then is THE ANGEL, here peculiarly refer'd to: THE ANGEL, *who spake to Moses in the mount*; nor with him only, but, as St. *Stephen* expresses it, *with our fathers*: Meaning, either, in the general, the camp of *The Israelities*; or else, more especially, *the seventy elders*, that went up with *Moses* into the mount, and *there saw God*. Not that they, as a body of men; but *Moses* only, as *the mediator* of that dispensation, re-

¹ Acts vii. 38.

² Ibid. ver. 30.

ceived the lively oracles¹ from the mouth of GOD or CHRIST.

AND this, it may be observ'd, by the way, is full proof that *the law*, given by the disposition of angels, is no other, than what I have explained it above: Namely, not *the whole body* of their laws [here called *the lively oracles*] at large, making up the far greater part of the four last books of *Moses*; but only *that one branch* of it, which is term'd *the moral law*, or, as we commonly speak, *the ten commandments*: Which, it should likewise be observ'd (as hinted above) is no more than a *summary* of that branch of their law; particular explanations of it being afterwards given by *Moses* in various parts of his writings.

AGAIN: There being *this* remarkable difference between THE ANGEL, whom St. Stephen here refers to, and *the angel* spoken of at the 53d verse; it is likewise a proof that these two passages, though coupled by your lordship, are, by no means, *strictly parallel*. Because this latter text relates merely to one single circumstance; that is to say: The giving forth the ten commandments at mount *Sinai*. Whereas, the former includes *Moses* familiar attendance on CHRIST, and GOD in HIM, during his repeated converse with him in the mount; and, indeed, for the whole of his ministry in the wilderness. But then,

² "Ος ἐδέξατο λόγια ζῶντα, &c.

II. SECONDLY, Your lordship observing that St. *Stephen*, whose words these are, was a *Jew*; and, it being certain, that the persons, to whom he was now discoursing, were those of his own nation: It is matter of surprise to me, that your lordship did not recollect the following circumstance: Namely, that as St. *Stephen* was now speaking to *The Jews*, it was but natural for him to speak *in their dialect*. And, again, that *The Jews* in common (as has been observ'd) made use of the word *angel* with very great latitude; so as to include in it, among other senses, even THE DIVINE BEING, or JEHOVAH, himself. But these being known facts, the consequences are as follow: First, That this signification of the word *angel* being familiar to *The Jews*, St. *Stephen* might very safely use it; because his auditors were in no danger of taking it in a wrong sense. Whereas, the contrary being the case with us, it, in the next place, suggests a point of duty: That we should not pronounce upon it, till we have, first, thoroughly informed ourselves in the *ancient* usage of the term. And then, lastly, That, when we have once acquir'd the *true sense* of the word, as it came from the mouth of St. *Stephen*, we shall be assured; that it was neither spoken by him, nor understood by his hearers, to intend any *created angel* whatever; but intirely meant of THE MESSIAH, THE LORD *from heaven*; a person

person, that always involves THE indwelling GODHEAD.

As to the two other scriptures, quoted by your lordship, on the present occasion, from St. Paul, viz. Where he saith, that *the law was ordained* BY [not OF, I presume, as your lordship puts it; as though they were *principals* in this affair, but BY] ANGELS¹. And, again, where he calls *the law*, the word *spoken* by ANGELS²: What hath been already observ'd, in reference to their ministry at mount Sinai, where they were employed to give out the ten commandments in *an audible manner*; sufficiently explains the sense of these texts, without our recurring to *Michael*, or any other created angel, as the person cloth'd with the *incommunicable* name.

I COME now to the consideration of *section LXI*, which, with the five following sections, contains, I apprehend, the most extensive view we have from *The Essay* of *Michael's* character, as acting in quality of MEDIATOR; provided, we may suppose, either that your lordship considers him in that light, or designs to exhibit him as such to the reader³.

As

¹ Gal. iii. 19.

² Heb. ii. 2.

³ I AM afraid, on farther reflection, that I have been too hasty, even in supposing *The Essay* capable of entertaining the least suspicion of A MEDIATORIAL PERSON, in my sense of the word; which means, an existence of such a *lower nature*, prior to all that we term creation, as might serve THE DIVINE BEING, both as a *tabernacle*, in point of residence; and as a *medium* in point of operation.—However, the mistake itself has this advantage attending: That it proves the means of suggesting to me,

As to the immediate design of this LXIst section, it is, to oppose the accounts of the xxivth chapter of *Exodus*, verses 10, 11; where

me, as strong an argument against *the quality*, in which *Michael* and *Gabriel* are supposed to serve; and, consequently, against *The whole Trinity* contended for by *The Essay*, as any unprejudiced reader can possibly desire. For if it be granted, that *The Essay*, in this part of it, wholly turns on the doctrine of THREE distinct, unconnected PERSONS; and therefore, that the consequence, in respect of THE ONE GOD, commonly called THE FATHER, really is: That he there makes no other appearance, than that of a solitary being, subsisting altogether by, or within, himself, as a pure, simple spirit; we shall then readily find, that an hypothesis of this sort, can no more comport with *the nature of things*, than it can with *the dictates of sacred revelation*. The reasons for this assertion, in both its parts, are as follow:

FIRST, Because it is equally inconsistent with *the relative glory* of THE ONE GOD, and *the general happiness* of the reasonable creature. For, where God cannot be enjoyed; there, of course, the creature cannot be happy. But this is absolutely the case, where ALMIGHTY GOD is represented, as a simple, infinite, divine essence. Because, the consequence of it is: That he dwells in *that light*, which is inaccessible to the creature. From whence we are again allow'd to infer: That as they are, by this means, precluded all converse with him; so, of necessity, all communications from him. Which means, in a word, that they are eternally distant, and therefore must be for ever unsociable. Hence then,

SECONDLY, It will likewise follow, as to those particular persons, *Michael* and *Gabriel*, that they must each of them, be immediately disqualified for those stations, which are assigned them by *The Essay*. Because THE ALMIGHTY, being in himself an infinite, invisible spirit, and they being among the class of mere creatures; we readily perceive; that *the distance* and *disproportion* between them and THE ONE GOD, is such, that as they stand secluded every approach to his person, by their very nature, *h. e.* as creatures; so they cannot possibly be in circumstances to receive any delegation of power at his hands. The general reason is: That *the necessary centre of union*; *the point*, where they should meet, is confessedly wanting.

AND, as a doctrine of this kind is perfectly consonant with the dictates of scripture, as will be shewn presently; so, likewise,

when
Aaro
elders

wife,
what
Essa
"pro
he is
which
by an
"bly
where
comp
Ti
is co
of ou
tures
a sol
abstr
by J
the
evid
A
AN
the
thof
plat
find
cre
SON
of
An
I
abo
pre
fro
wo
of
at
giv
of
[t
pr

where we are told, concerning *Moses* and *Aaron*, *Nadab* and *Abihu*, and seventy of the elders of *Israel*, who went up into the mount by

wife, is it founded in the principles of *true philosophy*: And, what is yet farther to be observed, is actually admitted by THE ESSAY itself; as it supposes, that “ the Almighty God is—— “ *probably* [or, rather, I apprehend, *certainly*; both because he is *an infinite*, and *the only infinite spirit*: in consequence of which, he is, undoubtedly, incapable of being circumscribed by *any system of matter*. “ The Almighty God is——*probably*] the only unembodied Spirit that exists”. §. xxxi. And, where it farther calls him THE invisible JEHOVAH. §. lxiv, compared with §. lxii. Once more,

THIRDLY, *The present hypothesis* cannot subsist; because it is contrary to *that known fact*, in reference to the production of *our world*, and, indeed, the production of *all systems of creatures* in general: Namely, that *God created all things*, not as a *solitary*, but as a *social being*; not as a *pure, eternal spirit*, abstractly considered; but, as the text expresses it, *Eph. iii. 9.* by *JESUS CHRIST*: That is, as *dwelling in*, and *operative thro'*, the man, *CHRIST JESUS*.——So that here the *DIVINE oracle* evidently opposes the scheme now in view.

AND, therefore, though we speak of THE *DIVINE BEING*, as AN absolute GOD, and as THE *GOD of nature*, seemingly in the same sense, and as though we meant to represent him by those terms, in a *distant, unsociable light*; yet, when we contemplate those *relative characters* on the plan of *revelation*, we find: That *he never acted alone*, in reference to any system of creatures; but still in *connexion* with THE *MEDIATORIAL PERSON*: Notwithstanding we were favoured with no intimations of that person, till after *the disobedience* of our first parents. And then,

LASTLY, As the doctrine of *The Essay* is contrary to the *above known fact*; so likewise, is it contrary to *repeated, express declarations* of *scripture* on this subject. Which are so far from giving us any idea of THE *FIRST CAUSE*, relative to the works of creation and redemption, as acting by the ministry of *two mere creatures*, and as keeping himself, at the same time, at the distance of an *infinite, invisible spirit*; that the account given us in this particular by *CHRIST himself*, in the character of *WISDOM*, under the old testament is: *JEHOVAH possessed ME* [that is, I apprehend, as *his shekinah* or *habitation*, *his throne* or *temple*: *JEHOVAH possessed ME*] in the beginning (or, as it is in

by the command of God, that *they saw* THE God of Israel, and *did* [yet live to] *eat and drink*; with other accounts in the xxxiii ch. of *Exodus*, 20 and following verses, which give your lordship occasion to observe: That not-

in the original text, ME, *the beginning*) of his ways (or way) BEFORE his works of old, Prov. viii. 22.—And the declaration of the new testament, quoted more than once, is: IN HIM, meaning CHRIST, *the fulness of* THE GODHEAD dwells bodily, Col. ii. 9. But to what purposes? Undoubtedly, first, as a *tabernacle of residence* to the person; then, as a *medium of operation or manifestation*: And, lastly, as a *veil to the insufferable glory* of THE DIVINE ESSENCE: Which, *in itself*, cannot but be, *as invisible* to the highest order of spirits in the upper world; as it is, to any of our own species, here on this earth. And, as it is thus *in itself*; so must it for ever have remained; unless THE DIVINE BEING had condescended to throw the veil of CHRIST's *humanity* over it: First, in his *pre-existent* spirit, and since in his *complete* person; both as a proper medium of access to ALMIGHTY GOD, and a necessary channel of conveyance from him; whether we are found the subjects of *redeeming mercy*, or of *punitive justice*.

WHEREFORE, to sum-up the argument: As *The Essay* makes no provision of this kind, nor pretends, either that *Michael* or *Gabriel* stand in *this connexion* with THE ALMIGHTY, or that they serve in quality of a *medium*, or *throne*, to him; it is certain, that neither of them have any, the least right to be considered, as wearing *those characters* and performing *those works*, which *The Essay* attributes to them. Because we may be sure, that THE eternal JEHOVAH is ever consistent with himself; intirely uniform in all his works [his nature, indeed, as AN INFINITE SPIRIT, obliges him to it:] and therefore that, as he did not act, but thro' a *medium*, in the creation of our system, which was CHRIST; so, neither does he act, but *in and thro' that same medium*, in the preservation and recovery of it.—So that, in contradiction to the doctrine of *The Essay*, the whole of the matter seems to be this: That *every thing*, both in nature and grace, *vests originally* in THE ONE GOD; and that THIS ONE GOD *acts in, and through* CHRIST, THE MEDIATORIAL PERSON: And, according to the work he has to carry-on, assumes to himself *different characters* [especially those comprehensive ones of FATHER and SPIRIT] as he finds them best adapted to express *his affection* on the one hand, and *his energy* on the other.

“ withstanding

“ withstanding “ *Moses* afterwards applied to
 “ God, and begged it of him, as a Favour, that
 “ he might see his Glory, or Face, that he
 “ might know him ; *JEHOVAH said unto him,*
 “ *thou canst not see my face ; for there shall no*
 “ *man see me, and live*”. After which, your
 lordship proceeds to infer, in *the next section*,
 as well from what ALMIGHTY GOD did shew
Moses, in consequence of his present request ;
 as from it's being said, “ that *Moses made haste,*
 “ *and bowed his head*” [towards the earth]
 “ and worshiped ”, on this occasion : That the
 person, whom *Moses* now saw, and therefore
 the person seen before by himself, *Aaron* and
 the seventy elders, was not THE true, eternal
 JEHOVAH ; but only A secondary JEHOVAH,
 meaning *Michael*, the archangel.

Now, as it is here proper, that we not
 only acquaint ourselves with your lordship's
 sentiments in *these* several sections ; but also,
 that we acquire full light in the merits of the
 argument itself, taken in it's whole compass :
 It will be impossible to secure these ends, with-
 out transcribing so much of the xxxiiid chap-
 ter of *Exodus*, as may be necessary to lead us
 into a particular examination of every thing
 relative to the subject, as well on the part of
 holy scripture, as on the representations made
 by your lordship.

It will then be proper to begin at verse
 the twelfth : *And Moses said unto JEHOVAH :*
See, thou saiest unto me, Bring up this people :
and thou hast not let me know, whom thou wilt
send

send with me. Yet thou hast said: I know thee by name, and thou hast found grace in my sight.

13. Now therefore, I pray thee, if I have found grace in thy sight, shew me now thy way, that I may know thee; that I may find grace in thy sight: And consider, that this nation is thy people. 14. And he said: My presence shall go with thee, and I will give thee rest. 15. And he said unto him: If thy presence go not with ME¹, carry us not up hence. 16. For wherein shall it be known here, that I and thy people have found grace in thy sight? is it not in that thou goest with us? So shall we be separated, I and thy people, from all the people that are upon the face of the earth. 17. And JEHOVAH said unto Moses: I will do this thing also, that thou hast spoken; for thou hast found grace in my sight, and I know thee by name. 18. And he said: I beseech thee, shew me thy glory. 19. And he said: I will make all my goodness pass before thee, and I will proclaim the name of JEHOVAH before thee: And will be gracious, to whom I will be gracious; and will shew mercy, on whom I will shew mercy. 20. And he said: Thou canst not see my face: For there shall no man see me, and live. 21. And JEHOVAH said: Behold! there is a place by me, &c. to the end of the chapter, of which in it's proper place.

HAVING then here before us, the *scriptural*

¹ It ought to be us, I apprehend, on the same principle, that our translators have *supplied* THEE in the preceding verse, from the latter branch of it.

state of the GREAT subject now under consideration ;

THE FIRST thing to be done, is to inform ourselves, WHO THIS PERSON is, with whom *Moses* now reasons, and to whom he thus prays.

I AM then humbly of opinion, that this is no other than JEHOVAH himself, even THE JEHOVAH of *hosts*, as your lordship distinguishes. By which character, I mean, not AN absolute DEITY, or the DIVINE ESSENCE merely ; but THE ONE GOD, commonly called THE FATHER, resident in CHRIST. My reasons, for supposing that THE ONE, eternal JEHOVAH, was now *truly* and *personally* concern'd in the transaction before us, are these :

I. BECAUSE *Moses* appears to apply to THIS JEHOVAH for information concerning THE PERSON, who should conduct *The Israelites* to their promised settlement in *Caanan*. What then is the implication in this conduct on the part of *Moses* ? Certainly, that he looked on the personage to whom he now addressed himself, as *the sovereign arbiter* in the present affair. It therefore carries with it a demonstration, that he considered him as having the right of nomination wholly in his own power. But this being granted, what is the one inference natural from it ? Without doubt, that it is THE invisible JEHOVAH ; the sole disposer of every person, and every event universally !

II. ANO-

II. ANOTHER reason in the present case is : That *Moses* appears extremely solicitous, that *the presence of this very person*, to whom he was now applying for information in this particular ; that *the presence of this very person*, and not *that of another* (as your lordship, in the general, insinuates) should go with them, verse 13.—But, whether we judge of this person by the reasoning under the foregoing head, or by the relation, in which he appears to stand to the whole body of *The Jews* : Or, whether we form an estimate of him, by the place, which he evidently holds in *Moses*' affection ; and by the peculiar advantages, which he promises himself, in case he might succede in securing his continued presence ; or, by such other particulars, as manifestly arise from the context : I cannot but think it abundantly clear, that no other person, than THE eternal JEHOVAH himself [though IN CHRIST] is intended. Again :

III. IF ever THE true JEHOVAH concern'd himself, *personally*, in the affairs of the *Jewish* church (and that he did, is clear, from his resentment of their idolatry, and refusing to go with them on that very account ;) we have then the highest reason to conclude, that it is still THE same JEHOVAH, to whom *Moses* here addresses himself. Because it does not appear, that there is *any change* of THE DIVINE PERSON, interesting himself in the af-
fairs

fairs of this people, from the time that *Moses* received his orders in *Midian*, to visit *The Israelites*, and bring them out of *Egypt*; to the grand period we are now speaking of. And therefore, as we can be sure, that the person, who then spake to *Moses*, and gave him his instructions on that head; was, in the *first* sense of the text, the ETERNAL, SELF-EXISTENT BEING himself: [For, if it be true of CHRIST, as a lower nature with THE DEITY resident IN HIM; it cannot but be likewise true of the ALMIGHTY himself, acting the *ministerial* part IN, and THRO' CHRIST¹. I say, as we can not only be assured of this;] but also, that the same person continued his charge of *The Israelites*, and acted for them throughout: So, we may conclude, with the last certainty, that it was, and could not but be, THE, invisible JEHOVAH himself, with whom *Moses* was now pleading in their favour. But this leads me to observe,

IV. AS THE true JEHOVAH was, undoubtedly, *the person offended* by their idolatry in setting up *the golden calf*, and had threatened, on that occasion, to withdraw himself entirely from them; and, as it farther appears by the drift of *Moses'* discourse in this place, that he was anxious for the presence of that person, with whom he was now treating:

¹ See for the full illustration of this point, *Preliminary Observations*, VI. and VII, p. 206, &c. compar'd with *Obs.* VIII, p. 308. See also the explications of *The Essay* on that character, I THAT AM; §. II. p. 3, 4.

What can be clearer, than that this person was no other than **THAT DEITY**, who had been offended; and who, by his threatening, appeared to have it in his power, either to go with them, or not to go? either to indulge them his presence, or to appoint them a substitute? Things then, in respect to the present grand event, appear to be exactly circumstanced as above: What therefore so natural as to suppose, that *Moses* would apply to this same person? Either, first, more generally, as we find he does, at verse *the twelfth*; or else, as emboldened by favours, in the next place, more particularly; which is the purport of the *following* verses: To know, in the former case, what person **THE ALMIGHTY** would be pleased to order in his room; or, in the latter, to intreat, that he would take the future care of *Israel* upon himself? Nay, that I may carry it yet farther: Who was there, but **THE** invisible **JEHOVAH**, to be applied to in the case? Because, first, as his anger had been incur'd; he alone was the person to be solicited, for the laying it aside. And again, secondly, because the determination of the matter was wholly in his own breast. And, therefore, lastly, because, supposing *Moses* could either appease his anger, or find it was appeased; it would not only afford him ample room to hope for the return of this same injur'd person amongst them; but also to press that return, together with such other instances of indulgence, as their circumstances, from time to time, might make necessary.

V. Not

V. NOT to allow, that THE invifible JEHOVAH was here the fupreme object of *Moses'* prayer, and concerned, as PRINCIPAL, thro' the whole fcene: would be to degrade the ALMIGHTY himfelf; to tarnifh the glory of the *Jewifh* church; to deftroy the evidence of fcripture, and to deify a creature; by turning that work over to *Michael*, which is alone fuited to God himfelf, *b. e.* GOD in CHRIST. Once more,

VI. THE EVIDENCE for this *continued* prefence of THE ONE eternal JEHOVAH, with the *Jewifh* church, through the whole period of *Moses's* miniftry, is perpetual. Every page of his writings, whether it turn on civil or religious obfervances, on moral or judicial laws; witneffeth to this great truth. Not to remark, that the ftrict injunctions they were under to keep themfelves, both individually and collectively, from all natural as well as all ceremonial impurities, through their whole progrefs in the wildernefs, both in their perfons and in the camp, is likewise full proof on this part of the fubject. Add to this,

VII. As a farther irrefragable testimony, *the former part* of GOD's message to *David* by *Nathan*, on occafion of the king's having formed a defign of erecting a temple to THE ALMIGHTY at *Jerufalem*: Go, fays GOD, and tell my fervant *David*, thus faith JEHOVAH:

U 2

Shalt

Shalt thou build me an house for me to dwell in? Whereas I have not dwelt in any house, since the time that I brought-up the children of Israel out of Egypt, even to this day; but have walked in a tent and in a tabernacle. In all the places wherein I have walked with all the children of Israel, spake I a word with any of the tribes of Israel, whom I commanded to feed my people Israel, saying: Why build ye not me an house of cedar? Now therefore, so shalt thou say unto my servant David: Thus saith THE JEHOVAH of hosts, &c. ¹—This then, is a testimony from the mouth of JEHOVAH himself, even THE JEHOVAH of hosts; acknowledged by your lordship to be THE ONE SUPREME GOD ². For, as it is by this name, that the person, who here dictates to *Nathan*, speaks of himself; so is it likewise by the same name, that *David* addresses him at the 26th verse of this chapter.

VIII. LASTLY, It being allowed, that CHRIST [a branch of the human nature] was THE ANGEL, who did externally, or more immediately, conduct the children of *Israel* from *Egypt* to their settlement in the land of *Canaan*; it undeniably follows from thence, that THE DIVINE BEING, or ONE GOD, cannot be secluded from attending them on any occasion whatever. [Though the tokens of his presence might not be always equally conspicuous.] Because, where CHRIST, HIS SHEKINAH, is;

¹ 2 Sam. vii. 5—8.

² *Essay*, §. lxvi.

there,

there, likewise, are we sure to find **THE ONE GOD**: Not only by *his authority* or *power*; but also, by *his real indwelling* and *personal presence*.

BUT I need not enlarge here; because the several particulars under my next head, will be so many arguments in proof of what I have now under consideration.—It may not, however, be improper, before we come to that head, to look a little into your lordship's sentiments on this point. And that, because your lordship appears sometimes to concur in the above state of things; and sometimes (if I am happy enough to understand you) wholly to dissent from it.

I. FIRST, It should seem, that your lordship is either positively in this opinion; or, that you give the reader just ground to draw an inference of this kind:

1. BECAUSE it is very observable, that your lordship, in a certain place mentioned below, considers those words, **THY FACE** and **THY GLORY**, as *synonymous*. But, if those terms are *synonymous*; so, likewise, are these other, **THY WAY** and **THY SELF**: the latter, according to your lordship, being exegetical of the former. Putting all of them, then, on the same foot, it is not more certain, that they must all unite *in one person*; than it is certain, that *this person* must be **THE** invisible **JEHOVAH**. But, if there be room to observe, that

See *Essay*, lxiii.

Margin, note [2.]

your lordship, either expressly, or by consequence, supposes all these characters to centre in THE ONE invisible JEHOVAH; it will, likewise, from thence be just to conclude, that you suppose THIS invisible JEHOVAH to have been *the sole object* of *Moses'* present address. The proof of which lies here: Namely, that there is no other subject, in whom any one of these characters can inhere, but THIS invisible JEHOVAH.

BUT, notwithstanding it is exceeding clear, that an argument arises, from this side, in favour of THE invisible JEHOVAH; I decline pressing it; least it should be looked upon, as taking your lordship at unawares, without any lasting advantage to myself. Because, as it is evident, by your farther explications of this term THY GLORY, that your lordship wrests it from THE invisible JEHOVAH, and applies it to what you call, *The delegated Jehovah*; the obvious consequence is: That the argument is too slippery to be retained throughout. And therefore, as it appears to be of such uncertain use in *The Essay*, as to serve the opposite sides of the question equally; it will be found to make as strongly against me in another part of the subject, as it can possibly be useful to me here. — But, with how much consistency, I submit to your lordship's consideration. — However, that what has been alledged in the begining of this head, is real matter of fact, may be seen in *section LXI*, where we have these words, quoted above — “ *Moses* —
“ begged

" begged it of him, as a Favour, that he " might see HIS GLORY or FACE ". Again, I infer in this manner,

2. BECAUSE there appears to be full as much, if not more reason, why your lordship should suppose, THE invifible JEHOVAH the true fpeaker on this occafion; as there is for fupposing him fuch on another, and that, an apparently lefs. For, as you grant, by *fection* LXIV, that it was THIS GOD (for fo I underftand the word) who faid to *Mofes*: *Bebold! I fend an angel before thee, &c.* And alfo, MY NAME IS IN HIM¹: What can be your lordship's objection to the fupposing him now again prefent, after he had threatened to defert them; and, at a time too, when *Mofes* was folliciting JEHOVAH in favour of *The Israelites*, and beging he would let him know THE PERSON, who was to conduct them? This, again, I take to be the matter of fact,

3. BECAUSE, as your lordship allows, agreeable to the text itfelf, that JEHOVAH told *Mofes*, he could not fee HIS FACE; but that he fhould fee HIS BACK-PARTS: One would be inclined to think, that your lordship, from the natural conftruction of the words, cannot but fuppose, that no other perfon could, on the one hand, deny the fight of HIS FACE; nor, on the other, promife the fight of HIS BACK-PARTS; but fuch perfon, who had abfolute property in thefe things. And that this could

¹ Exod. xxiii. 20, 21.

be no other, than THE true, eternal JEHOVAH, appears from hence: That we are not more certain, THIS FACE belongs only to THE invisible JEHOVAH, in the nature of the thing; than we are likewise certain, that BACK-PARTS are here made equally *the property*; nay, an *appendage*, of THE same invisible JEHOVAH.

4. NOT but, were we to suppose the reasoning, in the cases above, doubtful; yet that one expression, the saying, *Thou shalt see MY BACK-PARTS*; in your lordship's avowed explication of the words, binds this part of the intercourse, effectually down to THE invisible JEHOVAH. Because, if, according to your lordship, HIS BACK-PARTS, or WHAT FOLLOWED HIM, be *personally distinct* from THE true JEHOVAH, THE true JEHOVAH must, of necessity, be the person, who is now conversing with *Moses*. The reason is: Because the speaker, in this place, plainly distinguishes between HIS FACE and HIS BACK-PARTS: that is, according to your lordship, between HIMSELF and *Michael*; proving therefore, on this view of the words, that by FACE he speaks of HIMSELF, as THE invisible JEHOVAH; and that, by HIS BACK-PARTS, on your lordship's interpretation, he speaks of *Michael*, as *The visible, or delegated Jehovah*.—Upon which principle, again, it is, that your lordship (allowing only the exception above) always sets those several characters, HIS WAY, HIS GLORY, and HIS BACK-PARTS, in constant opposition to that single character, HIS FACE. Again,

5. YOUR

5. YOUR LORDSHIP appears to concur in this opinion, from what is observable *in performing the promise* here made. For you allow, that it was THE invisible JEHOVAH, who proclaimed the name of *The other Jehovah* to Moses¹. What stronger proof then can we desire? Because, if THE true JEHOVAH (as I must distinguish him) did the work; he, certainly, charged himself with it. And as he thus charged himself, in consequence of Moses' application to him for it; so, he performed it, in consequence of his own promise upon that application.—If THE true, invisible JEHOVAH fulfil'd the promise; he must, undoubtedly, have been the person, whom Moses now solicited.—Agreeable to this, it is observable, not only that the name JEHOVAH perpetually occurs on this occasion; but also, that he here absolutely engages himself, for the performance of every thing, that was to be done in this affair. Wherefore he saith peremptorily: *I will make proclamation IN the name (of) JEHOVAH before thee*²: Which is an *Hebrew* idiom, and therefore, in *English*, is the same as saying: *I will proclaim my name* (saying) JEHOVAH, &c. And it is notorious, that the *Septuagint* translators (to whose authority, I am certain, your lordship cannot object) understood the place in this strict reference to THE invisible JEHOVAH, giving us therefore the

¹ *Essay*, §. lxiv.

² וְקִרְאתִי בְשֵׁם יְהוָה רַפְּנִיךָ
[Vekarathi beshem JEHOVAH lepanecha.]

follow-

following version of the words, exactly to the present purpose: *I will call to thee BY MY NAME*, saying: THE LORD [JEHOVAH] is *before thee*¹.—Besides that, those terms THY WAY or WAYS, and THY GLORY (as they stand in our translation) *The Septuagint* still renders by the word ΣΕΑΥΤΟΝ, THY SELF; verses 13 and 18: Which it should likewise be observed, is a version approved of by your lordship.

THIS then, I think, is plainly *Moses'* state of the case; and it should seem either explicitly, or by natural, easy deduction, to be likewise your lordship's. And yet, I have to observe,

II. SECONDLY, That there is, nevertheless, a difficulty attending the present conclusion on your part; and, indeed, such, as forbids a peremptory determination in the point. The reason is: Because, though your lordship allows, or, one would think, should allow, the above observables, mentioned in favour of THE invisible JEHOVAH, as the person here applied to by *Moses*; particularly, that of *his promising* on the one part, and *fulfilling* on the other; yet in *section LXIII*, your lordship tells us, that *Moses* “ desired of God to shew him his “ glory, that he might know the person who “ was to conduct the *Israelites* into the promised land ”.—Now, it is doubtful, what,

¹ —καλέσω τῷ ὀνόματί μου, Κύριος ἐναντίον σου.

particular person your lordship may mean by the term GOD in this place: That is, to use your own words, whether THE invisible, or the delegated JEHOVAH.

I. I OWN, I am much inclined to understand it of THE invisible JEHOVAH. And I should think, I had sufficient warrant for it, not only, because I apprehend it is past doubt, that your lordship uses the word GOD in this sense, once and again, in *section* LXIV; but likewise, because there is reason to be assured, that your lordship, as observed above, uses that term, HIS FACE, in direct opposition to these words, HIS GLORY; [that is, in the general:] explaining the former (HIS FACE) by JEHOVAH, as meaning THE true GOD; and the latter (HIS GLORY) by HIS BACK-PARTS, as meaning *Michael*: I repeat it, I have inclination enough to understand the word GOD here, in this sense; were I at liberty to explain the term on the above principles; the advantage of which would be, that then THY WAY, THY PRESENCE OR FACE, and THY GLORY, would all evidently centre in THIS true GOD; as they certainly do in the text itself, as given us by *Moses*.

BUT, it so happens, that to preserve this consistency in the scriptural narrative; I must be obliged to set your lordship at variance with yourself. Because, nothing can be more repugnant, than to suppose THE true GOD here applied to by *Moses*; and yet make those several terms, THY WAY, THY GLORY, and THE
NAME

NAME now proclaimed, referable to *Michael*: As we, nevertheless, evidently must, in consequence of the *marginal note*, annexed by your lordship to *section LXIII*. That, therefore, which embarrasses the whole subject, is,

2. THAT your lordship not only makes HIS GLORY and HIS WAY *synonymous*; but, by applying both those characters to *Michael*, and then explaining the latter character (HIS WAY) in your marginal note, after *The Septuagint*, by those words, *shew me THY SELF*; your lordship gives room to suspect, that by GOD in this place, we are to understand no other person than *Michael*. The result of which (comparing this view of things with that given above) is: That we are by this means led into several intricacies. Because, if it be so, that these expressions, *shew me THY GLORY* and *shew me THY WAY*, are of the same import with those words, *shew me THY SELF*; and the former words (GLORY and WAY) be applied to *Michael*; it gives us reason to conclude, as these are so many articles of prayer, or humble intreaty, in the mouth of *Moses*: That he had, in all of them, regard only to one and the same person: Which person, by such promiscuous application of the words (evidently countenanced by your lordship's *marginal note*;) must, as I said before, intend no other than *Michael*. In consequence of which we shall find: First, that these several characters [GOD, GLORY, WAY and THY SELF] are not a little confused. Secondly, that all distinction

inction of persons, though contended for by *The Essay*, is actually destroyed. And, lastly, that your lordship inverts both the object, and the subject-matter of the prayer here put-up by *Moses*.

1.) THE FIRST of these will be the case, on the explications we are confined to by *the marginal critique*, supposing we were to understand the word GOD, in the text of *The Essay*, of THE invisible JEHOVAH; though, in this state of the question, *the characters*, now more directly before us, would be the only immediate sufferers: Whereas, if we must be obliged to understand the term GOD in this place, of *The delegated Jehovah*, as your lordship speaks; then indeed, *all the characters*, through the whole scriptural narrative, will be found equally involved.

IT must be thus with *the above characters*, on supposition that the term GOD is here used of THE invisible JEHOVAH. Because, when those expressions, THY WAY, THY GLORY, and THY SELF in the margin; are once made *synonymous*, and applied jointly to *Michael*, which is our case by *the note*: It is plain, that THE invisible JEHOVAH has immediately lost all *personal* interest in them, whether taken separately, or in the gross. Because, though he be called GOD, *b. e.* THE invisible JEHOVAH in the text of *The Essay*; his character is, nevertheless, absolutely changed by your lordship's *marginal comment*.

AND,

AND, that *all the characters*, introduced on this occasion, by the sacred historian, must likewise suffer in this way, supposing we understand the present word, GOD, of *The delegated Jehovah*, may be thus prov'd : Because, if those terms, THY WAY, THY GLORY, and THY SELF ; be equally applicable to *Michael* (at the same time, that we have your lordship's authority, in a particular instance¹, for making THY GLORY and THY FACE *synonymous* :) It will then follow, that no distinction can, at any rate, be preserved, between THE GLORY, *b. e.* THE FACE of THE invisible JEHOVAH, and THE BACK-PARTS of THE same JEHOVAH. Because, in this view of the subject, form'd intirely on your lordship's plan, they will be found, one and all, to centre alike in *Michael*, the archangel. That is to say : He will be, at once, both THE FACE and THE BACK-PARTS of THE invisible JEHOVAH ; or, which is rather a shorter way of putting it, THE invisible JEHOVAH himself. But that brings me to

2.) THE SECOND difficulty started above. This, however, requires no enlargement, as it is barely a consequence of what has been now last observed. Because, where *the characters* themselves are blended, it is not to be suppos'd, that any *true distinction* of persons can possibly subsist. Wherefore,

3.) LASTLY, An inversion, both of *the object* of *Moses' prayer*, and likewise of *the subject-mat-*

¹ See above, p. 310, 311.

ter of it, must ensue. Because, on the present state of the case, he must be supposed to address *The delegated Jehovah*, instead of THE INVISIBLE; and therefore beg, that he might see THE GLORY of *The delegated* [that is, *Michael*, according to your lordship;] instead of THE GLORY of THE invisible JEHOVAH.—

Or, yet more fully to explain this last article, I may exhibit it thus: When we compare your lordship's explication of this passage, with what seems the obvious meaning of the passage itself, there appears but too much room to conclude, that not only the person here prayed to, and the person performing, are quite different; but also, that the thing prayed for, and the thing actually represented, are equally different.

THAT it stands thus in reference to *the persons* themselves, seems very clear. Because, according to the text, it is natural to suppose, that *Moses*, at this time, addressed THE invisible JEHOVAH. Whereas, according to your lordship, it looks, as if you meant, that he addressed *The delegated Jehovah*. Because, as your lordship allows, that *Michael* is THE WAY of THE invisible JEHOVAH, and observes, that *shew me THY WAY* is tantamount to *shew me THY SELF*; it follows (if things are consistent) that *Michael*, as THIS WAY and THY SELF, must be the person addressed.

AND then, as to *the thing requested*, that, according to the text, is, that THE invisible JEHOVAH would shew *Moses* HIS GLORY; meaning,

ing, his own PERSONAL glory, as the ONE SUPREME G O D. But, according to your lordship, he must pray, that *The delegated Jehovah, Michael*, would shew *Moses* himself; both as THE WAY, and therefore, the [RELATIVE] glory of THE invisible JEHOVAH. — With this difficulty, likewise, in the case: That, at the same time, that your lordship refers THIS WAY, THIS GLORY and THY SELF to *The delegated Jehovah*; you own, that THE invisible JEHOVAH was the person, who *exhibited* the several things here solicited. — Not to observe, that there is likewise this farther impropriety in the case: That your lordship makes *Moses* ask that favour of *This delegated Jehovah*, which it was neither *absolutely* in his power to conceal [not only, because he was wholly at the disposal of another; but also because, by your lordship's account, he had NO SUCH GLORY, or FACE, as THE invisible JEHOVAH:] nor, *really*, in his power to grant. Because, as it depended upon; so, according to *the letter* of the text, it had, before, been promised by THE invisible JEHOVAH: supposing THY WAY, as your lordship does, *synonymous*, with THY GLORY. The promise itself, however, is fact, be the terms [THY WAY and THY GLORY] applied, as they will; meaning, whether to THE invisible, or the delegated, JEHOVAH. Because, we have a declaration to this effect, both at the 14th and 17th verses of this chapter; as will be seen more fully, by and by. The
confe-

consequence therefore of the present observation, is: That *Moses'* request [*shew me THY GLORY*, at the 18th verse] in this view of it, must come to just nothing at all.

How these things are to be adjusted, I take not upon me to say. But so far as I can judge, on *the confuse view* they here make, it appears to me: That, as your lordship, in this case, has equally departed, both from the sense of the text; and, I am obliged to say, from your own opinion, in certain places refer'd to above, as I understand them: You have not only lost the point, you seem, at least, *covertly*, to have been aiming at; which was to prove, that *This created Jehovah* was the person, *Moses* prayed to [for that appears to be the insinuation couched in *the marginal note*; especially, when taken in connexion with the general doctrine of *The Essay*.] But your lordship has given us, by virtue of *this marginal note*, one of the best arguments in the world against your own scheme, and in favour of that here proposed. Because, as you there tell us, that the words, *THY WAY*, signify *GOD HIMSELF*; and it appears, that *THIS GOD* is not *The Jehovah*, of whom you have explained it, but *THE invisible JEHOVAH* himself: So, it proves, beyond a possibility of doubt, that *Moses* addressed no other person, than *THE invisible JEHOVAH*; and that no other person, than *THE invisible JEHOVAH*, promised to undertake in the present affair.

- Not but I have farther to observe on those words by your lordship:—" it was on this very account that *Moses* desired of God to shew him his Glory, that he might know THE PERSON" [which, I think, by the way, is making THE GLORY of God and *this person*, one and the same intelligent being; which *person*, again, by your lordship's general explication, is *Michael*; confirming therefore all that I have advanced in the preceding observations on this passage: " that he might know the Person] who was to conduct the *Israelites* into the promised Land": I say, I have farther to remark on these words: That there is reason to think, your lordship must certainly be mistaken in the present account. Because it is very evident, by consulting the history at large, as I have transcribed it from the xxxiiiid chapter of *Exodus*; that *Moses* did not prefer this request [*shew me THY GLORY*] till every thing relative to THE PERSON, who should take the conduct of *The Israelites*, had been actually settled between JEHOVAH and *Moses*: Nor, in short, till THE invisible JEHOVAH had absolutely promised to take this charge upon himself, according to verse 17: *And JEHOVAH said unto Moses, I will do this thing also, that thou hast spoken*: Meaning, that he would HIMSELF go with them.

IT is then after this, and therefore not till he had succeeded in that grand point, which so eminently concerned the whole camp; that *Moses*, by this means emboldened, takes upon him

him to ask *a particular favour* FOR HIMSELF, verse 18 : *And he said, I beseech thee, shew me* THY GLORY.—For though we should allow, that he might have *a previous reference* to a view of this kind (though, I own, that point is far from being clear to me;) at verse 13th, where he saith, *shew me now* THY WAY : Yet there, it can only be supposed to intend *a more general sight* ; rather, in favour of *The Jews*, as his charge, than of himself, personally considered ; or, at the most, as a matter, that involved their joint happiness. [But that it did peculiarly regard his acquiring satisfaction in the important business of *a future conductor*, or *leader* ; seems to me pretty strongly implied in the particle *now* : *Shew me now thy way*. Because it is certain, that this was a point, which lay with present weight upon his mind ; and in which likewise he was, at this time, intirely to seek.] Whereas, in the case above, *shew me* THY GLORY ; he appears to solicit a favour in a more especial, restrained manner, and as matter of a more distant, detached nature : Such, as seems to me, to bear no relation to the general subject in hand ; but to be wholly of the private and personal kind : both as it appears to intend nothing farther, than a display of God's own private glory ; and to be designed only for the personal satisfaction of *Moses* himself. So that *Moses'* whole view, in this part of his petition, seems to have been this (as an instance of human frailty, or natural curiosity :) That he

might have to boast such a view of THE excellent GLORY, as neither himself, as yet; nor any mortal intelligent creature, before him, had ever enjoyed.

BESIDES, it should be farther consider'd, that to take this request exactly in the same sense, with that at verse 13th, *shew me* THY WAY; would be to make *Moses* guilty of a needless repetition, or, rather, of a palpable absurdity. Because, agreeable to a hint but lately given, it would be to make him solicit anew for that favour, which had been already granted; not only by JEHOVAH's saying, *my presence shall go with thee*, ver. 14; but again, by his adding on *Moses'* farther solicitations, *I will do this thing also, that thou hast spoken*, ver. 17. But as this was, evidently, taking the conduct of *Israel* into his own hands; and therefore was a request at large; we may reasonably suppose, that *Moses* would not solicit the same thing again; and, consequently, That this request, at the 18th verse, *shew me* THY GLORY, is both a different thing in it's own nature, and is actually to be considered, as a particular favour beg'd for himself.

IT appears then, by what has been now said, that we have not only the plain sense of the passage under consideration in our favour; but also, your lordship's *concessions* on the one part, and your *critique* on the other; all conspiring to assure us, that THE true invisible JEHOVAH, is THE PRINCIPAL in this glorious

2 Pet. i. 17.

tran-

transaction.—But then, to prevent mistakes, it will be remembered, that, according to the doctrine advanced in these sheets, THIS invisible JEHOVAH, by no means, signifies, AN absolute DEITY (as we commonly speak;) or A pure, simple DIVINITY, acting *immediately*, in the strict sense of the word; *b. e.* solely, in his own person, and absolutely *without a medium*. Far, I apprehend, very far is this, from being the matter of fact. Because THE JEHOVAH of *revelation*, appears to be no other, than GOD in CHRIST.

HERE then, comes in that person, who takes part in the present affair, meaning, the conduct of *The Israelites*; and in all other operations, with THE invisible JEHOVAH. For, as CHRIST said, in the days of his flesh; so, might he say, as a pre-existent spirit in union with GOD: MY FATHER *worketh hitherto, and I work* ¹.—Here is the person, who appears *externally*: As, at first, in *the creating*; so, since, in *the government* of all things: Being, likewise, capable, as a lower nature, both to take the appearance, and act the part of AN ANGEL, where occasions requir'd it; yet, neither excluding *the presence*, nor superseding *the power*, of THE ONE, supreme GOD; that DIVINE fulness, which was pleased to make him HIS TABERNACLE.

So that to judge aright of *This Subject*, THE invisible JEHOVAH, a peculiar circumstance, as to *situation*, is always to be taken into the

¹ John v. 17.

account ; which is, as above observed : That THIS invisible JEHOVAH, though always PRINCIPAL, is never to be considered alone ; but as *dwelling in*, and *acting through* HIS SHEKINAH.

AND that *this particular* is necessary to complete the account, and make the whole of a piece ; the whole consistent and scriptural ; will appear with the strongest evidence, when I come to shew, that it is *in this circumstance*, and *this only* : I mean, in OUR SAVIOUR'S connexion with THE true JEHOVAH, or, as THE true JEHOVAH *dwels in him* : That all the characters, which your lordship, in *these sections*, gives to the person, whom you suppose described by those terms, WHAT FOLLOWED JEHOVAH ; will be found applicable to CHRIST, THE REDEEMER.

HOWEVER, not to refer the whole evidence, to what is future in this explication ; here is, immediately, this good reason to be observed for the point now asserted : Namely, that THIS JEHOVAH always descends to *Moses in the cloud* ; always converses with him *through that veil* : than which, we can have no fuller, or more significant emblem, of *the connexion*, which subsists between THE DIVINE and MEDIATORIAL PERSONS ; or, in other terms, of THE FATHER'S dwelling in CHRIST : And not only of his *dwelling in him* ; but also, of his *speaking through him*, and *acting by and with him*. It is a positive assurance, that they do nothing *separately* ; but, on the contrary, *in perpetual*

perpetual conjunction.—And with this state of things intirely comports, what OUR LORD has delivered, under the character of A PROPHET, in the new testament, where he tells us: That *his doctrine was not his own, but THE FATHER'S, that sent him*¹. And that *the words, which he spake, he spake not of himself; but as THE FATHER, which dwelt in him, gave him commandment, or instruction*². And again, as to his works, in the character of A SAVIOUR, he likewise informs us, saying: *THE FATHER, that dweleth in me, he doth the works*³. —And, lest this should not be sufficient to inculcate *the connexion*, that there was [and is] between HIM and HIS FATHER; and his acting in *perpetual concert* with him; he declares farther in these words: *THE SON can do nothing of himself*: that is, neither abstracted from THE indweling GODHEAD, or FATHER, as to his [THE SON'S] person; nor, in consequence of any private schemes, or separate views of his own; but, on the contrary, *THE SON doth, whatsoever thing, he seeth THE FATHER do*⁴: Meaning, that he is always prepared to follow his intimations, or concur with him in the execution of all his DIVINE counsels. Thus, as we commonly say, going on *hand in hand*, in the administration of all affairs, whether natural or spiritual.

¹ John. vii. 16.
ch. xvii. 8.
ch. v. 19.

² Ibid. ch. xiv. 10, compared with
³ Ibid. ch. xiv. 10, and x. 38.

⁴ Ibid.

BUT, in reference to the general argument now before us; which means the settling *the true object* of *Moses'* present address: Be it then, as it will, in respect to *the precise person*, intended by the word GOD in the passage quoted above. Nay, more: Be it so, that there are certain considerations, from which we might be led to infer, that your lordship is of opinion, that THE invisible JEHOVAH is this GREAT personage; and, yet, others again, and those more direct, if not more numerous; why we should rather conclude, that your lordship supposes him to pay this compliment wholly to *Michael*¹: This, however, is certain, amidst

¹ AMONG other considerations of this kind, it will be readily seen, that *The Essay* supplies us with such as these: Namely,

1. THAT it supposes THE invisible JEHOVAH, if not *intirely absent*, yet *wholly inactive*, on much greater occasions; particularly, that of giving forth the law at mount *Sinai*: where, either the angels in common; or *Michael*, at least, as their chief, is made *principal*; and not THE invisible JEHOVAH, *as present in*, and *acting directly through*, CHRIST, THE MEDIATOR. [See *Essay*, §. lxvi.]

2. AN INFERENCE of this kind is natural, because *The Essay* resigns *the general conduct* of *The Israelites* wholly to *Michael*. Once more,

3. BECAUSE it supposes him, *in particular*, to be the person every where resident *in the pillar of cloud* [section lix.] consequently, therefore, that person, who now conversed with *Moses* through that medium. Again,

4. ANOTHER reason leading to this inference, is: That, *The Essay* looks upon *Michael* to be the person here called THE GOD of *Israel*. And therefore, that it was *Michael*, and him only, who was seen by *Moses* and *Aaron*, and *Nadab* and *Abihu*, and the seventy elders of *Israel*, in the mount, *Section lxi*, lxii. And then,

5. LASTLY, *The Essay* leads to a conclusion of this sort, because it is found, *in the general*, to use those words, THY GLORY, in an opposite sense to that, in which they appear to have been spoken

midst all the obscurity thrown on this subject by *The Essay*: That your lordship never declines applying those several august characters, THY WAY, THY GLORY, and even, THY FACE (in that one instance where it is made *synonymous* with THY GLORY;) and, lastly, as the substance of the whole, THYSELF; to, what you are pleased to call, *The delegated Jehovah*, meaning the archangel.

NOR is it only to be remarked, that the *characters* themselves; but, as a necessary consequence, *the business* laid up in them; and, likewise, all the marks of dignity, included in THAT stupendous NAME, which was proclaimed on this occasion: or, in one word, the contents of the whole narrative, in all it's variety and compass, are absolutely given-up to *This* same delegated *Jehovah*.—And are these your lordship's real sentiments concern-

spoken by *Moses*, and understood by THE invisible JEHOVAH (if we may be allowed to judge of these things on the authority of the sacred text.) Because as JEHOVAH tells *Moses*, that *he could not see HIS FACE*, both as a kind of *restriction* upon, and yet a *genuine explication* of his request, in saying, *show me THY GLORY*: It is plain, that JEHOVAH himself understood both these expressions as *synonymous*, and therefore, as what center'd fully in his own person. Thus also giving us a *determinate idea* of the sense in which they were used by *Moses*: viz. As having the same strict reference to THE invisible JEHOVAH. Whereas, those words THY GLORY, though here used by *Moses* of THE TRUE GOD, and understood by THE invisible JEHOVAH, of HIMSELF; are, nevertheless, by the *common explications* of *The Essay*, applied to the archangel, *Michael*. The consequence of which is: That *The Essay*, supposing those terms descriptive of *Michael*, and not of THE invisible JEHOVAH; must, likewise, suppose, that *The delegated*, and not THE invisible JEHOVAH, is the object of *Moses'* address in this chapter,

ing

ing the GREAT subject of the text? Is this the peremptory designation of the above characters, whether they include *oeconomy* on the one part, or *divinity* on the other?—Pardon me, my lord, when I take the liberty of observing: That before you can either add weight to this doctrine, or support it's credit with the intelligent christian; it will be incumbent on your lordship, to give him ample satisfaction in the following important articles:

I. FIRST, It will be expected, that your lordship shew us, at what precise period of time, and on what memorable occasion, *This delegated Jehovah* was introduced, to take the conduct of *The Israelites*, in the room of THE invisible JEHOVAH; going no farther back, than their provocation against him in setting-up *the golden calf*. For, though it is commonly said, that he threaten'd, on account of that heinous sin, to withdraw himself from the people, and to commit them to the care of a *created angel*¹: Yet, as it is certain, that THE supreme JEHOVAH, before his making this promise to *Moses* in the xxxiid chapter, was thoroughly appeased; and, again, that this promise is absolutely of the same import, with a promise made to them before their transgression about *the golden calf*, at chapter xxiii. ver. 23; the promise being delivered exactly in the same terms, MINE ANGEL *shall go before thee*: I say, for as much as the pleasure of THE

¹ Exod. xxxii 34.

ALMIGHTY appears to have been the same on this head, even after their fining at *Sinai* (because he had been appeased by *Moses*) with what it was, in this respect, before their provoking him by that act of idolatry: I own, I cannot but believe, that by HIS [or AN] ANGEL in both these places, no other person is meant than CHRIST himself, THE ANGEL of the covenant, or THE REDEEMING ANGEL. And it appears, that the *Hebrew* commentators understood it of him¹. By which, I apprehend, every seeming objection from this quarter is, at once, fairly removed.

AND I am greatly mistaken, if we shall not find this account confirmed, by what I have to observe below on a *third text* of scripture relative to this subject, where GOD speaks of THIS ANGEL, as having HIS NAME IN HIM². Because, as it will there appear, that THE NAME of GOD is put for GOD HIMSELF; so, it will be full proof, I apprehend, that JEHOVAH had always the same GLORIOUS person in view, as the conductor of *The Israelites*: Whether he speak of him only as AN ANGEL, or as HIS ANGEL; always meaning THE MESSIAH in his *pre-existent* spirit, and therefore always including himself *as resident* in that spirit. Agreeable with which is likewise to be observed: That THE ALMIGHTY takes all that work upon himself *personally*, which he, at any time, tells *Moses*, he would execute by the ministry

¹ Vide *Poli Synops.* in *Exod.* xxiii. 20.
ver. 21.

² *Ibid.*

of THIS ANGEL. As, therefore, he had said concerning this person, that *he* [HIS ANGEL] *should go before them, and bring them in unto The Amorites and The Hittites, &c. and that he would cut them off by him*¹: So, he says afterwards, concerning himself, *Behold! I drive out before thee The Amorite and The Canaanite, &c.*². Thus, as I observed above, appearing to have no other person in view, when he speaks on this subject, but CHRIST, THE ANGEL of the covenant.

HOWEVER, as the common opinion is against me, let it be here supposed, that THE invisible JEHOVAH did threaten to deliver them up to a *created angel*; it is, nevertheless, observable: That this is a bare threatening; a threatening never carried into execution. Because it is evident, not only, that THIS JEHOVAH repented of his purpose on this head, and therefore reversed the threatening itself; but also that, on the intercession of *Moses* at this time, he promises to charge himself with the care of them in their journey to *Canaan*³.

IF the whole of this be not satisfactory, I recur to what was advanc'd in the beginning of this particular: Namely, that it is incumbent on your lordship to shew us, where it is, that there is a change of the DIVINE person in this affair. Nor, indeed, will it be amiss (as a proof of our strength in the argument) to ex-

¹ Ibid. ver. 23.
with ch. xxxiii. 2.
ch. xxxiii. 12—17.

² Ibid. ch. xxxiv. 11. compared
³ Ibid. ch. xxxii. 14.

⁴ Ibid.

tend the inquiry; desiring, therefore, it may be shewn, where there was any change of this kind, even from THE invisible JEHOVAH's appearing to *Moses* in the land of *Midian* [for, I think, I have proved above, that THE invisible JEHOVAH was, at that time, personally concern'd¹;] when he gave him orders to bring-up this people from *Egypt*; down to the present period, meaning that, wherein *Moses* solicits THE ALMIGHTY, according to accounts in this xxxiiid chapter of *Exodus*. For, if no change, at all, can be found; but that the same person, who acted at first, continues to act throughout; the consequence must be, that the object of *Moses*' address, could be *no created angel*, but THE invisible JEHOVAH himself.—But to advance in the argument:

II. As your lordship asserts, that it was THE invisible JEHOVAH, who *proclaimed* THE NAME of *The delegated Jehovah*, it will be necessary, that your lordship put us into a method of making this consistent with the plain doctrine of *the text*. For, that there is not an agreement in this case, between *the text* and *The Essay*, will appear by observing as follows: The person, who here promises to proclaim THIS NAME, calls it HIS OWN NAME. Therefore, speaking in his own person, he says, *I will proclaim MY NAME*; parallel to which, we may likewise observe, is, that other expression, according to *The Septuagint*, *I will pass*

¹ See page 287, compared with p. 325, &c.

before

before thee in MY GLORY : [or, after our own version, *I will cause all MY GOODNESS, &c.*] Immediately on which, and in strict connexion, follow those words: *I will proclaim MY NAME*. So that, according to these declarations, there seems to be *no second person* concerned, therefore, of course no created angel, as the subject of this part of the converse between JEHOVAH and *Moses*. It appears, however, on the contrary, that, as the person, who makes this promise and undertakes to fulfil it, is one, an individual; so, that he promises in his own person, and promises intirely for himself. Which, again, exactly falls-in with your lordship's explication of the word THY WAY, when you render it, after *The Greek*, THYSELF: thus making the whole of it centre intirely in the same person, and therefore obliging us to apply both the NAME itself, and the proclamation of it, to THE invisible JEHOVAH. Because, if he, according to your lordship, be the person, who proclaims THIS NAME, we can be positive, on the authority of the text, that it was HIS OWN NAME, and not THE NAME of another. Here then is the difficulty: Namely, how that, which is THE NAME, THE WAY, THE GLORY of THE invisible JEHOVAH, personally considered; should yet, according to your lordship, be the strict property of *another intelligent being*, even a *created angel*. The means,

¹ Ἐγὼ παρελεύσομαι πρότερός σου τῇ δόξῃ μου.

there-

therefore, of reconciling the explications of *The Essay*, with the doctrine of *the text itself*, is the matter required.

III. ANOTHER thing, which it will be proper your lordship should shew us on this occasion, is : That as THE GLORY of THE eternal JEHOVAH is THE only GLORY properly *invisible* ; what the distinction is between seeing *the glory*, h. e. *the face* of the *created* Jehovah, and seeing *what followed him*. Or, rather : Since *the glory* of this *created* Jehovah is *visible*, by your lordship's concessions, *sections LXI* and *LXII* ; it will be kind to inform the reader, what were the advantages *Moses* was to attain by seeing *his back-parts*.

IV. BESIDES the demands above, it will be farther expected of your lordship, that you prove to us : How it is consistent with the perfection and dignity of THE invisible JEHOVAH, not only to become *an herald* to the archangel at this juncture (for that, as we have already seen, is allowed by your lordship ;) but even to resign to him, both the possession of his own infinite perfections, and the divine homage, which is alone due to himself, on account of those perfections. For, as your lordship positively asserts, that *This secondary Jehovah* was the only person, that *Moses bowed the head to*, and *worshipped* ¹ ; it is ne-

¹ §. lxii.

cessary to conclude, that you likewise suppose him to have interest in all the glorious particulars of THAT NAME, which THE true JEHOVAH proclaimed. Some account therefore, is to be given, evincing *the ratio* of this transfer on the part of THE DIVINE BEING ; and, likewise, of this acquisition on the part of *Michael*.

I REPRESENT the subject in this light, because, if your lordship will not allow, that it was THE BACK-PARTS of THE true JEHOVAH (in a different sense from that, put on those words by *The Essay*) which *Moses* now saw ; neither will you, to be sure, allow, that it was the attributes of THE invisible JEHOVAH, which *Moses* worshipped, while he was now bowing to *Michael*. Because the consequence of that would be, that then *Moses* worshipped *the wrong object* : That is, he paid the homage, due to THE true JEHOVAH, to *This secondary Jehovah* ; at the same time, that *This secondary Jehovah* had no interest in those glorious perfections, which could alone intitle him to the worship here paid by *Moses*. The reason is : Because THE DIVINE BEING, according to this latter state of the case, is now to be considered in full possession of those attributes, and not *Michael*. But then,

V. A MUCH heavier task, which will yet lie upon your lordship, will be : To make the whole of this consistent with your own scheme.
For

For though your lordship sets out in telling us, that there is but ONE supreme GOD; that THAT ONE BEING is independent, and that *Michael* is only a creature; and, therefore, only intitled to subordinate worship: yet, it so falls-out, in the course of what is delivered in *The Essay*, that your lordship *really forgets*, that this same archangel is only a creature. Hence it is that your lordship,

IN the first place, gives to him the *incommunicable* name [JEHOVAH;] which, I may venture to affirm, is peculiarly designed to intimate THE ONE supreme BEING: and which, I will therefore take upon me farther to affirm, is never applied, either to person or things, but in reference to *the immediate presence* of THE true, invifible JEHOVAH. The application of this character, if juſt, abſolutely depends *on the preſence of GOD HIMSELF*. And, therefore, *that preſence* was always attendant on *the ark*; always viſible in *the tabernacle* and *the temple* of Solomon: And ever, in the higheſt and moſt eminent ſenſe, in CHRIST, the ſum and ſubſtance of *the ark, tabernacle* and *temple*: CHRIST being *that tabernacle*, which GOD built for his own *perſonal* reſidence, and not man.

HERE then, if the character JEHOVAH, be ever applied to *the tabernacle* and *temple*; here, I ſay, it is properly applied. Be cauſe we have, in theſe caſes, *that preſence*, which will fully ſupport the application. But, take away *that preſence*, the inhabitation of THE GODHEAD,

Y

and

and resolve the matter into *commission only*, or a quantity of *delegated power* [a power too, as we have seen above, that *cannot be lodged* with a mere creature ¹ ;] and it instantly falls to the ground. But to proceed :

HENCE, again, it is, that your lordship make *this* same *Michael*, every thing in *creation* and *providence* ; that you ascribe to him *all the perfections* proclaimed on the present occasion, and, therefore, every thing necessary to *redemption* and *grace* : In short, hence it is, that your lordship gives-up to him *those peculiar*s of THE INVIVIBLE JEHOVAH (if we speak of these terms in their first and proper sense) here called HIS WAY, HIS GLORY ; and, indeed, without taking the advantage of a certain explication mentioned above ², I might add, HIS FACE. Because, if HIS WAY and HIS GLORY are synonymous terms, and signify GOD HIMSELF, as your lordship allows ; it is certain, that those other words, HIS FACE, can signify no more.—What then has your lordship more to compliment him with ? Or, what is the one superior qualification, which you have yet left to bestow on *the* JEHOVAH of *hosts* ? Actions, we say, speak louder than words. To what purpose then is it, that your lordship calls him *supreme* and *independent*, as was said above ; when you manifestly strip him of every thing, that should render him *such*.—And this (let not the expression

¹ See marginal note, p. 298.

² See p. 309; &c.

be offensive, for it is hoped *truth* may apologize for it; this) is the one palpable contradiction, that runs through *The whole Essay*: Namely, THE true GOD is every where degraded, unless it be here and there, *in words only*; and, when facts are described, *This* delegated *Jehovah*, this mere creature, is deified, and set-up in his room.

ONE article, however, proper to this head, I had like to have forgot; that is to say, the affair of *worship*.—This, your lordship tells us, in reference to *The* delegated *Jehovah*, is only *subordinate* worship. True, it is asserted; but what is *the fact*? Moses *made haste, and bowed his head and worshiped*¹. WHO? *This* delegated *Jehovah*. And, with submission, what more could he have done, supposing he had been to worship THE invisible JEHOVAH? Where is the mark of *an inferiority of worship* in this place? Pardon me, my lord, for the freedom of speech; I can discover it *only in word*; while facts appear every where against you.—But thus it is: where the argument is over-charged, it cannot but fall with it's own weight.

NOT but, it were easy, to extend this impropriety in the case before us, by considering this present *object* of *Moses'* worship [h. e. *what followed* THE invisible JEHOVAH, according to your lordship] on *the common plan* of interpretation; which, I imagine, will generally be allowed a very good one. For then, taking

¹ *Essay*, §. lxi, lxii.

those words [*what followed him*, OR HIS BACK-PARTS] for *all the works of GOD universally*, or *all his external manifestations*, so far, at least, as we are capable of acquaintance with them (thus too including *Michael* among the rest;) the consequence will be as follows: *viz.* That to worship *what followed* THE invisible JEHOVAH, in this sense of the word, would be to put all the works of GOD, promiscuously, on a level; if not with GOD himself, at least, with CHRIST, his first and capital production: And therefore, farther, to worship all of them indifferently, in the same *positive* manner; which means, without considering them barely, as so many mediums, either leading to, or centering in *the* JEHOVAH *of hosts*; but as so many *direct objects* of worship themselves, either separately or collectively. — Hitherto then of the GLORIOUS personage, with whom *Moses* is here treating, whether by argument or otherwise. I come now therefore,

SECONDLY, To the next observable in this passage, which is to consider, more particularly, what is *the subject-matter* of *Moses'* discourse with JEHOVAH, and likewise *the subject-matter* of his intercession, or, *the thing*, which he more immediately *solicits* on this occasion.

I. As for the subject-matter of *his discourse*, we have it at verses 12, 13, and 15; containing, first, a more general inquiry concerning THE PERSON, who was to conduct them: In which point *Moses* urges a discovery, both
from

from THE ALMIGHTY's condescension to him in telling him, that *he knew him by name* ; and also, from the indèared relation, in which *The Jews* stood to him, as *his peculiar people*. And, secondly, a more direct intimation of his having an immediate view to the DIVINE presence ; a passionate desire, that JEHOVAH himself would go with them ; followed by arguments to press this discovery and secure this presence, verse the 16th.

II. AND as these particulars contain the substance of his present converse with JEHOVAH ; so, do they, likewise, in the general, the substance of *his prayer*. For, in reference to these things he intreats, verse 13, that GOD *would shew him HIS WAY* ; and then deprecates their removal from the wilderness, unless THE ALMIGHTY would vouchsafe to accompany them, verse 15 ; till emboldened by GOD's promise to comply with the above request, he comes to prefer a particular petition for himself, verse 18 : *I beseech thee, shew me THY GLORY*.—— Now, if those words, *shew me THY WAY*, signify (as your lordship explains them) *shew me THYSELF* ; then these latter words, *shew me THY GLORY*, would be of the same import, and contain only the same prayer, enforced with greater vehemence.—— My reasons against taking the words *absolutely* in this sense, have been offered above ; nor will they, I imagine, be found wholly destitute of weight. It appears, however, I think, that the general import, both of what *Moses* speaks about, and

the one thing, which he aims at in his prayer, considered more at large; was: That JEHOVAH would *actually* go with them; wherein he keeps in a consistency with himself, and confirms, what he had always delivered on this head. And then, taken more strictly, in reference to himself (for it is wholly in that light, I would choose to consider this part of his address, *shew me* THY GLORY;) the point he seems to have in view, as already intimated, is: That ALMIGHTY GOD would indulge him an extraordinary display of HIS OWN personal GLORY; in distinction from *the glory* of every other intelligent being; which, considered as *the glory* of another person, his creature, could, at most, be only called *the relative glory* of THE invisible JEHOVAH.

So that, whether we consider *Moses*, as *reasoning* the matter with JEHOVAH, or, as addressing him *by prayer*; one and the same person appears intended in both cases: Namely, THE invisible JEHOVAH. The question then to be ask'd upon this occasion is: Would *Moses* petition for *one thing*, and THE ALMIGHTY, by way of indulgence, shew him *another*? Would *Moses* earnestly solicit the presence of THE invisible JEHOVAH, and God promise him the company of *the archangel* only? But this, probably, may be best resolved by proceeding,

THIRDLY, To another article, which merits examination in this history, which is: To consider, more fully, what *the answer* was, that JE-

JEHOVAH returned to *Moses* in consequence of this interview.

Now this, taking the subject at large, either was : That THE ALMIGHTY *would give Moses his presence*, verse 14 ; confining the promise more directly to *Moses* himself ; as well to support him under present difficulties, as to provide for his future incouragement, while charged with the conduct of *The Israelites* : Or else (as *Moses* appears by no means satisfied with this private or personal promise) that HE, THE invisible JEHOVAH, *would actually journey with the whole nation*, verse 17. This, however, is still considering the answer of THE LORD more generally. Because the thing here immediately before us, is, *the particular reply*, which he made to *Moses*, respecting his own private request. And this is delivered, first, more at large, and, as it were, waving the real point, that *Moses* had in view, according to our translation : *I will make ALL MY GOODNESS to pass before thee*, verse 19. And then, in the next place, more precisely ; first, by telling him, negatively, what he could not see ; namely, HIS FACE. And, afterwards, positively, what he should see ; viz. HIS BACK-PAKTS, verse 20, 23.

So that, if we may be allowed, to put the whole of this into our own phraseology, it is, as though THE ALMIGHTY had said to *Moses* :
 “ Thou desirest to see me fully and distinctly.
 “ That cannot be granted. Thou shalt, how-
 “ ever, see me obscurely and in part. Thou

“ wantest me to throw aside my veil, and to
 “ stand forth in that GLORIOUS form, in which
 “ I am beheld by the spirits of the upper
 “ world ; that by this means, thou mayest
 “ have an opportunity to stand and gaze upon
 “ me in that resplendent figure : Thy request
 “ (as though JEHOVAH had continued) in this
 “ extent of it, cannot be indulged. It is in-
 “ compatible with thy circumstances, as an
 “ inhabitant of clay. But this I promise thee,
 “ that I may give thee the last proof of my
 “ singular regards to thyself, personally ; and
 “ of my gracious intentions towards the body,
 “ of the people, thou hast now in charge : I
 “ will not only give thee a view of MY BACK-
 “ PARTS ; a more obscure prospect of me as
 “ I am to be known *a posteriori* ; but, I will
 “ also let-out so much of THAT GLORY, thou
 “ speakest of, as shall be consistent with the
 “ preservation of thy life : as much as thy mor-
 “ tal weakness will any way sustain : Thou
 “ shalt have a glance of it, as I pass by : But
 “ the full blaze of MY GLORY would over-
 “ power thee ; would consume thee at once ” .

Now, does not all this inhere perfectly in
 the same subject, THE invisible JEHOVAH ?
 And therefore prove, that the person, with
 whom *Moses* was now treating, was actually
 THE DIVINE BEING, and not *Michael* ? Were
 it not thus, the text would evidently be at va-
 riance with itself : *Moses* requesting, and God
 promising, *one thing* ; that is, a display of HIM-
 SELF (though in a lower degree, than what
 he,

he, at first, wanted;) but, in the return, JEHOVAH exhibiting, and therefore *Moses* beholding, *another*: Namely, the view of *a creature*, instead of a view of THE ALMIGHTY. However, to pass this. It will be proper, fully to understand the subject,

I. FIRST, To enter into an examination of your lordship's *version* of this place. And,

II. SECONDLY, To consider *the various terms*, which are made use of on this occasion; such as, 1. HIS WAY. 2. HIS GLORY. 3. HIS FACE. And, 4. HIS BACK-PARTS. Wherefore to begin,

I. WITH *the former* of these heads. It is then very obvious, that your lordship, instead of keeping to the words in OUR BIBLE, *thou shalt see MY BACK-PARTS*; has rendered the place, *thou shalt see WHAT FOLLOWS ME*¹: herein, I presume, copying the *Septuagint* translators. The words, in *that version*, are: τὰ ὀπίσω μου——Why then *this singular* in your lordship's translation? *The Greek*, you are very sensible, *justly englished*, reads thus: THOSE THINGS, *which are AFTER, or BEHIND ME*. And it is thus, that *Gregory Nazianzen*, understood the place: Ταῦτα γὰρ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰ ὀπίδια, ὅσα μετ' ἐκείνον, &c.²

¹ *Section*, lxi, &c. in loc.

² See *Bishop Patrick's comment*.

SOME account then is, surely, to be given for the present liberty : I mean, the giving those words *in the singular number*, which, in the text from whence they are borrowed, stand in *the plural*.—Besides, where is either the reason, or justice, of confining those terms to ONE intelligent AGENT, which appear to belong strictly to *a variety of THINGS*? Or, rather : What is the principle, that will justify us in supposing, that the above terms are capable of a PERSONAL reference, and THAT ONLY? Or, should such reference be allowed, in part, there will be yet this farther enquiry : Upon what evidence, either of reason or scripture, is it pretended, that *the description* is to be understood of *Michael*, and not rather, of a branch of *our own nature*; one much nearer to THE ALMIGHTY : Namely, JESUS, THE DIVINE SHEKINAH? For, at present, your lordship's application in this case is merely *gratis dictum* : A bare assertion, without any colour of argument to support it.

I AM very sensible, it was fully to your lordship's purpose, to have the text signify, as you have put it; but, certainly, that is not to be submitted to as proof. You saw, without doubt, that *the common reading* kept the different parts of the account in a too close connexion, to admit of their being accommodated to your lordship's scheme. What then is to be done? Change the reading, and give it your own sense. But besides, that what has been now observ'd is a glaring truth : I mean, that

THE

THE FACE of GOD, and THE BACK-PARTS of GOD, keep one and the same subject in view (therein terribly thwarting your lordship's *hypothesis*) give me leave to ask : Is not *the opposition* between the different parts of the verse, that is to say : Between what GOD promises *Moses* should see, and what he tells him, he could not see ; much more natural ? Much better preserv'd by the *vulgar* reading, than that introduc'd by your lordship ?——*Moses* could not see THE FACE of GOD ; what then stands in opposition to HIS FACE ? Certainly, THE BACK-PARTS. Wherefore, MY FACE, saith JEHOVAH, *thou canst not see* ; but, as the subject *directly opposed* to this, JEHOVAH goes on and saith : Thou shalt see MY BACK-PARTS. Thus making the whole description inhere in himself. And, is not this a sufficient reason, for retaining the *common* reading ; or, at least, the sense applied to that reading ? I can be positive, nothing of that weight can be added, I will not say, in support of your lordship's *version* ; but, rather, in support of *the turn, the interpretation*, here given to that version.

II. BUT I am next to examine *the various terms* made use of on this occasion, among which

I. THE FIRST is, that in the 13th verse : *Shew me* THY WAY.——Now here a double plan of interpretation presents itself to view. Because, according to the *Septuagint* version, the

the words are capable of reference to JEHOVAH himself *personally*; but according to the *Hebrew* text, they resolve themselves, rather, into *his providential conduct*: Which two explanations, though, at first, seemingly different; will, on farther inquiry, be found to unite in the main. Supposing therefore, on the *Septuagint* plan,

1.) THAT we are to understand the words in a *personal sense*. Here then, I apprehend, we can have nothing more to our purpose, than what your lordship has already furnished us with by your *marginal* note. The words are these: “ The original Word דָּרַךְ is used in a
“ great Variety of Senses in the Old Testa-
“ ment; the Septuagint Version renders it in
“ this place Σεαυτόν, thyself. And in the
“ same Sense it probably is, that *David*, pray-
“ ing to *Jehovah*, says, *God be merciful unto*
“ *us, and bless us; and cause thy Face to shine*
“ *upon us: That THY WAY (or Thou) may*
“ *be known upon Earth, thy saving Health*
“ *among all Nations*, Psal. lxvii. 1, 2. And in
“ Psal. lxxvii. 13. He says, THY WAY, O
“ *God (or Thou) is in the Sanctuary*. And
“ hence probably it is, that the Prophet *Amos*
“ calls the God or Idol of *Beersheba*, *the Way*
“ *of Beersheba*. Am. viii. 14.¹ ”

Now, farther to confirm this critical remark, and, at the same time, that I in some measure concur with your lordship in it; strengthen my own argument against *Michael's*

¹ See *Essay*, §. lxiii.

being

being the object of *Moses*' address in this place ; I have to subjoin : That *The Seventy* always render these expressions, THY WAY, THY PRESENCE OR FACE, and THY GLORY, in the same manner ; saying, in regard to the first of them, verse 13 : *Shew me* THYSELF. And again, as to the second term, verse 14 : MYSELF *shall go with thee*. And, as to the last, verse 18. (the words of *Moses* :) *Shew me* THYSELF. And, verse 19. (the words of JEHOVAH :) *I will pass before thee in* MY GLORY.—And that *Moses* might have a more distant and general reference of this kind, when he made use of this word, WAY, verse 13 ; there is some reason to conclude : First, from the answer, which GOD made him on the use of it in this place ; containing, as we may say, JEHOVAH's explication of the term, verse 14 : MY PRESENCE *shall* h. e. I MYSELF *will, go with thee*. And, secondly, from *Moses*' own explication of the word PRESENCE : Because, what he had called THE WAY of GOD in the 13th verse ; and what GOD had termed HIS PRESENCE, verse the 14th ; *Moses* afterwards expresses, in his reasoning this point with JEHOVAH, by the *personal* pronoun THOU, saying : *If* THOU *go not with us, &c.* verse the 16th.

NEVERTHELESS, thoroughly to understand the force of those words THY WAY, taken in this *personal* reference, two things are to be observed :

(1.) THE ONE, in regard to the PERSON himself : That, if we understand the word of

THE

THE invisible JEHOVAH (who is, doubtless, the supreme object in *Moses'* view;) it must, however, be considered intirely on the plan of revelation; by which I would be understood to mean, GOD in CHRIST. Or, if we refer the word, in a secondary sense, to THE MESSIAH; it must again, in a consistency with this same [scripture] revelation, be considered in such manner, as to include THE indweling GOD-HEAD: intending, therefore, THE MESSIAH *not as a mere man, or a mere creature*; but as THE MAN, in whom THE invisible JEHOVAH *dwels bodily*.—This for THE PERSON refer'd to. Again,

(2.) To complete our notions on this head, in a consistency with the whole context, particular care is to be taken in adjusting *the precise nature* of the reference itself. So that, though we suppose those words, THY WAY, may be referable to THE DIVINE BEING OF JEHOVAH himself; yet, I apprehend, we are to be apprized: That *Moses* has a very different view of the terms at the 13th verse, from what he uses 'em in, at the 20th; supposing the two words, THY WAY and THY GLORY, to signify, alike, THYSELF, in their reference to GOD. Because, if there be not some distinction in the case; it is certain, these two verses, and consequently, the above characters, must absolutely coincide. The consequence of which, as I have observed in another place¹, must be; that we shall involve *Moses* in a fruitless repetition, and there-

¹ See above, page 324.

fore a manifest tautology. The difference then, I apprehend to be as follows: Namely, that when *Moses* saith, *shew me* THY GLORY, according to the 20th verse; he means precisely, "give me a display of THYSELF in THY PERSON". And when he saith, *shew me* THY WAY, at the 13th verse, it is the same, as if he had said: *Shew me* THYSELF, in *thy purposes or counsels*. But this brings me directly,

2.) To the other interpretation of these words, keeping in a greater conformity to the original text: So that, *shew me* THY WAY in this view of the place, is the same as saying: "Shew me *the precise methods*, in which thou wilt conduct towards myself, and thy people, *Israel*; both for our present support and our future progress". In which state of things, THYSELF, as explained above, and THY WAY, as explained now, appear to unite or tally. Because, where THE ALMIGHTY vouchsafes a display of *the secret purposes and counsels* of his breast; there he may, certainly, in a good sense, be said to give a signal view of HIMSELF.

AGREEABLE with this construction of the text, it is to be observ'd, that the *Hebrew* word is frequently rendered in the *plural* number: *Shew me* THY WAYS¹. So that, on this view of the words, it is, as though *Moses*, bespeaking the DIVINE majesty, had said: "Disclose to me, I pray thee; *thy determinate counsels*

¹ Vide *Version. Arabic. Jun. et Tremell. and Ainsworth* in loc.

“ on the present posture of our affairs. Ac-
 “ quaint me with *the precise steps*, by which thou
 “ wilt hereafter conduct towards us, for the ac-
 “ complishment of thy many gracious promises
 “ to me and this people. Unfold to me *those*
 “ *measures*, which thou wouldst either have
 “ me pursue; or which, thou wilt condescend
 “ to pursue thyself, for the display of the se-
 “ veral glorious perfections of thy nature. In
 “ particular, let me know, whether thou wilt
 “ take the charge of this people upon thyself,
 “ or whether thou designest a substitute in thy
 “ room. Here (as though he had continued)
 “ all the perfections of thy nature are eminent-
 “ ly concerned: Vouchsafe, therefore, to let
 “ me into THE WAY, or WAYS, by which
 “ thou wilt give them their proper display in
 “ leading us through the wilderness to the
 “ promised *Canaan*”.

THIS, I must needs say, is that explication
 of the text, to which I cannot but give the pre-
 ference; not only for the reasons given above,
 at page 324, and here again just mentioned, I
 mean, the avoiding *an impertinent repetition*,
 &c; but also, because it is observable, that
 there is a real gradation, or order, in *Moses*
 converse with, and his address to, THE invis-
 ible JEHOVAH. For he begins with matters of
general import, and from thence descends to
 those, which are *private and personal*. He
 first, solicits for the whole camp; and, then,
 for himself only. Besides (as I have observed
 more than once) *the opposition*, which seems
 evidently

evidently to obtain between his request, at the 13th verse, *shew me* THY WAY; and the other, at the 18th verse, *shew me* THY GLORY; clearly demonstrates, in my humble opinion: That the former has respect to a conductor for *The Israelites* in general; but that the latter has respect to a personal display of THE DIVINE GLORY, for his own private satisfaction.—— Not but, as was said above, while we suppose JEHOVAH, condescending enough to unfold *the counsels* of his breast to *Moses*; he may, likewise, in a sense, be said to give him a sight of HIMSELF at the same time: that is, a real view of *his nature*, as it would open itself in a display of his DIVINE attributes.

WHEREFORE, as it is evident, in this state of the case, that both senses perfectly consist; so, if any choose to include both senses, I pretend to no objection against it; provided only, that they adhere to *the distinction* made above: and, therefore, give this *latter* sense the preference, as a more genuine account of the 13th verse. The reason, on which I profess the present approbation, is: That, even on the *personal* interpretation of the words, my argument will still subsist: I mean, that THE invisible JEHOVAH was certainly the supreme object of *Moses'* address. But I go on,

2. To the next term made use of by *Moses* on the present occasion; which is, where he says: *I beseech thee, shew me* THY GLORY.—— And, on this character, after the general explanations above, there is neither room for, nor

Z

need

need of enlargement. Thus much, however, though it be only a repetition of former hints, it is proper we should call into view : namely, That if by this term THY GLORY, *Moses* did not intend to solicit *an actual, or thorough display* of the DIVINE ESSENCE itself ; in such sort, as to have it in his power to distinguish THE EXCELLENT GLORY from every other being [for that is what some ancient writers, as well *Jews* as *Christians*, have heretofore supposed :] It is, nevertheless, allowed, that by the present request, he, at least, intended, his being indulged such an exhibition of THE ONE GOD, as is the exalted privilege of those happy spirits, who stand before *the throne*, and converse openly with him in the upper world. But this, I say, has been already observ'd :

IF, therefore, any thing farther remain, necessary to set this matter in a yet clearer light, it can only be to subjoin the following circumstance: Namely, that as JEHOVAH had often descended *in the cloud*, and *Moses* as often conversed with him through that medium ; so, it is probable, *Moses* might be ready to think, that JEHOVAH was resident there *in some particular, limited form*. Wherefore, improving the present opportunity, his design, in preferring this last request, might be (as hinted likewise before :) That JEHOVAH would condescend to remove *the interposing cloud*, and stand displayed to his bodily eyes in the full lustre of that GLORIOUS presence, in which he had promised to dwell among *The Israelites*.——This,
the

the greatest modern divines suppose, to be the extent of his petition; considering *Moses*, not only as too great a philosopher, but also too much of a christian, to imagine, that any mere creature, either in this or the other world, can ever be in circumstances capable of beholding the DIVINE ESSENCE itself.—Here then, we have still fight of one and the same person, that is, THE eternal JEHOVAH. But this leads,

3. To a subsequent character, which is that of FACE. For JEHOVAH, in return to *Moses'* petition, saith to him: *Thou canst not see MY FACE: for there shall no man see me, and live*, verse 20th.—Here, I apprehend, the meaning is intirely the same, with that under the last head, and therefore requires no additional notice. For, by THE FACE of JEHOVAH, is, undoubtedly, intended, if not the DIVINE ESSENCE itself; yet, that view of THE DIVINE GLORY, which is inaccessible to creatures in a state of mortality. And, therefore, it is observable, that what ALMIGHTY GOD calls HIS FACE in the former part of the verse, he terms HIMSELF in the latter part of it. *For there shall no man see ME, and live*. Wherefore

4. LASTLY, The only remaining character to be considered, is that, which our translators call THE BACK-PARTS of JEHOVAH; but, according to your lordship, WHAT FOLLOWED HIM.—Now, whether we take *your lordship's* or *the vulgar reading* (for there is a sense, in which your version will admit of accommoda-

tion to that reading;) the words will be capable of explication in one, or other of these ways. Namely, either

1.) MORE generally; as they may be supposed to refer to persons and things *merely natural*: For the terms, in this common acceptation, will take-in both. And, therefore, by THE BACK-PARTS of JEHOVAH, or WHAT FOLLOWED HIM, may be intended (agreeable to hints given above) *his works at large*; including all intelligent beings, as well as material or inanimate productions. For, as GOD is THE FIRST CAUSE of every thing, that exists, whether intellectual, or corporeal only; so, BEING *in general*, the whole system of creatures, may be termed HIS BACK-PARTS, or WHAT FOLEOWED HIM. And to Gregory Nazianzen's testimony for this sense of the place, as already produced, I might add that of Maimonides; who collating this passage with the 6th verse of the following chapter, explains them together, by Moses' having a discovery of JEHOVAH in *his works and attributes*¹. But then,

2.) THE ABOVE interpretation allowed, as part of the truth, or as the *natural* sense of the place; I must also observe that, fully to explain this character, it will likewise admit of a *spiritual* reference; in which application, the terms will be found to center more immediately in THE PERSON and OFFICE of OUR LORD. For if GOD's works, in common, are WHAT FOLLOWED HIM; much more, surely, may CHRIST be included in that general descrip-

¹ See Bishop Patrick in loc.

tion; as he is the *first* production of ALMIGHTY GOD, both as to HIS PERSON, and as to HIS CHARGE. And, again, as he is *the chief* or *capital* production of the DIVINE goodness and power: THAT PERSON, by whom, the whole system of creatures was brought into being at first; and in whom, the creatures of all ranks have been since held together. Nor so only: But as that production, IN WHOM the divine majesty himself resides; and THRO' WHOM he gave forth, from the beginning, and still continues to give forth, the fullest and most encouraging displays of himself in his nature and perfections: As for the support and well-being of his creatures in general; so, especially, for the support and conduct of his church in particular.—And, in this sense, your lordship will please to observe, the account fully answers to *your own version* (though not so strictly literal;) only that the application falls on a branch of the *human* nature, and not on one *super-angelical*.

HOWEVER, the general observation from the whole is: That explain these terms, and apply them, as we please, they still *supremely* and *ultimately* refer to one and the same person; namely, THE invisible JEHOVAH; CHRIST, in this case, being properly *an appendage* of himself, *b. e.* of THE invisible JEHOVAH. I come now,

FOURTHLY, To consider *the manner*, in which JEHOVAH executes this promise, or fulfils his present engagements to *Moses*.—Here

then the account, as we find it in the close of the xxxiiiid chapter of *Exodus*, is thus represented: Verse 21. *And JEHOVAH said: Behold! there is a place by me, and thou shalt stand upon a rock. 22. And it shall come to pass, while MY GLORY passeth by, that I will put thee in a cleft of the rock, and will cover thee with my hand, while I pass by. 23. And I will take away mine hand, and thou shalt see MY BACK-PARTS; but MY FACE shall not be seen.*

HERE then, is a particular view of the whole transaction. But, previous to the examination of the several heads of which it is composed, it will be necessary to insert this one general observation: Namely, that the whole of the present transaction, as it lay between JEHOVAH and *Moses*, had, undoubtedly, a *literal accomplishment*; but that, not terminating there, we have sufficient reason to believe, it has, likewise, a *figurative or spiritual reference*, in it's different parts; in which *figurative reference* it is, that we are to look for *the sublime, or divinity*, of the text. Wherefore, taking this preparatory hint, as an unerring clue along with us,

I. THE FIRST thing observable in the words is this: viz. *The particular situation* of the persons, respectively concerned in the present affair; and this

1. As

1. AS TO JEHOVAH, which is : That *he descends*, as usual, *in the cloud*, and *stands*, h. e. *converses, with him* (as we may suppose, before the grand scene opens, *stands*) *there in the cloud*.—Now this, as has been already observed, is a direct and lively emblem of the *humanity* of CHRIST : And therefore tells us, that JEHOVAH (which is the case throughout) is not to be considered as A NAKED DIVINITY ; but, as A GOD dwelling in CHRIST. And, it is well known, that with a strict regard to this [MEDIATORIAL] constitution, the text says : GOD *was* IN CHRIST, from everlasting, *reconciling the world unto himself*. Again,

2. AS TO *Moses* : Concerning whose situation, there are two things observable :

1.) FIRST, That he was to be *set upon a rock* ; and

2.) SECONDLY, To be put *in a cleft* of the rock. Both which expressions intimate *security*, though the latter more strongly.—*This rock*, in the letter, is supposed to be *Horeb* ; from whence water was afterwards brought-out for the service of *The Israelites* in the wilderness ; but, in the spiritual sense, it eminently prefigures OUR LORD : Who is, therefore, not only called A ROCK, at large¹ ; but, in reference to the present affair, St. Paul tells us : That THAT ROCK, *which followed them*, and supplied them with water [spiritual as

¹ Exod. xxxiv. 5.
Prov. viii. 23.
ch. xvi. 18,

² 2 Cor. v. 19. compared with
³ Matth. vii. 25. compared with

well as natural] during their pilgrimage, *was* CHRIST¹.

As to the latter head, more particularly; that is to say, *his being put IN A CLIFT OF THE ROCK*: It is supposed, in it's figurative application, to be expressive of a peculiar circumstance, relative to CHRIST himself, as THIS ROCK; giving us a precise view of him in *his death* or *passion*; a circumstance, on which the safety of the christian absolutely depends.

WHEREFORE, making due account of the exhibition before us, we have the pleasure of beholding THE DIVINE BEING, and the *human, laps'd* creature, respectively, in that distinguished situation, which is alone suited to *the grace* of the one, and *the misery* of the other. Because it is, in this case, particularly remarkable, that *the same preparation* is equally required on both sides; which means: That it is alike necessary, that THE eternal GOD be IN CHRIST, on the one part; and that the *reasonable, guilty* creature, be also IN CHRIST, on the other; before we can hope to obtain a distinct, safe, and comfortable prospect of THE DIVINE GLORY.—There is A CLOUD for JEHOVAH, as well as A ROCK for the sinner. But to go on,

II. To take notice of *such particulars*, as turn up, in the actual accomplishment of the promise itself; and of these

¹ 1 Cor. x. 4.

I. THE FIRST is: That JEHOVAH would cover Moses with his hand: To intimate, as was said before, a yet farther security of his person upon this occasion. Which, in the letter of the text, may probably mean: That THE ALMIGHTY, in his transit, would, in such manner, conduct, or manage the cloud (called an hand in scripture¹;) that it should, at this very instant, interpose between himself and Moses: and, by that means, become a kind of shelter or covert to him, from the more intense rays of HIS GLORY. A circumstance observ'd for the defence of the three disciples, who accompanied OUR LORD at his transfiguration on the mount; it being said, a cloud overshadowed them²; to screen them from that profusion of his glory, which broke forth on this memorable event.

MAY we not then, from this instance of the DIVINE care, be allowed to inquire as follows: As the principal design of this transaction, according to your lordship, was, that Moses might have a display of the glory of Michael: What necessity was there for the attendance of THE DIVINE BEING on this occasion? And, especially, for that pompous preparation, which appears to be made for exhibiting the present sight? Could not THE ALMIGHTY have obliged Moses at a much less expence? by having ordered Michael to take such an external form, as might have given Moses full satisfaction

¹ Job xxxvi. 32. compared with 1 Kings xviii. 44.

² Matth. xvii. 5.

respecting

respecting the nature, or even the visible figure, of **THE PERSON**, who was to accompany *The Israelites*; had *Michael* been **THIS PERSON**, and had *Moses* been only solicitous to have seen the glory of a created angel?

AGAIN: Where was either *the necessity*, or what *the propriety* of this act? I mean: That **THE** invisible, and incomprehensible **JEHOVAH** himself, should be made *the harbinger*, and *herald* to *Michael* on this occasion?

AND then, lastly and chiefly: How does it appear consistent with *the immutability* of **THE ONE GOD**, to resign those several glorious articles, which make the complement of **HIS OWN NAME**; to resign, I say, those several adorable perfections to a creature? those, which bespeak him, not only **THE true GOD**; but **A GOD** infinitely suited, both to the necessities of *The Jews*, as then circumstanced, and to the necessities of mankind in all ages; whether considered, in a common light, *as mere creatures*; or, *as the excellent* of the species, *real christians*? How could it comport, either, on the one hand, with **THE** invisible **JEHOVAH** himself, to make, *a transfer* of these attributes, at least; or, on the other, to set-up the archangel, *Michael*, rather than one of a superior order, as the person he would choose to clothe with these perfections?—Some account, I apprehend, according to a former demand, may be reasonably expected of this great and interesting matter.

¹ Psal. xvi. 3.

IF, then, it be said (as there is something looks this way, at *section LXIV* :) That *the solemnity* of the present conjuncture, or *the posture of affairs*, as they now stood between JEHOVAH and *Moses*, is an answer to all these questions : Meaning, that *This* delegated *Jehovah*, which is *Michael* the archangel, having been appointed by GOD to conduct *The Israelites* to the promised land ; THE invisible JEHOVAH, to do him the more honour, and recommend him the more effectually to the regard of *The Jews* ; thought it proper, to take the above measures *to enhance his authority*, more particularly with *Moses*, their visible leader.—Admirably struck-out, indeed !—However, neither to demand, by way of opposition, what the *particular* place of holy scripture is, where we may find *this delegation* to *Michael* expressly signified (it being certain, we have nothing, as yet, but *bare assertion* for this fundamental principle ;) nor to observe, that had *Michael* been the person represented, we might reasonably suppose, that *the present proclamation* would have been made, rather, in the audience of *the whole camp*, than as it is here, in private, to *Moses* only ; waving every thing of this kind : The one circumstance, that turns-out unfortunately for this part of the scheme, and therefore invalidates the reasoning aimed-at above, is : That, agreeable to ample proofs already given-in, *the wrong personage* happens to be here introduc'd.

GET us then, but THE true MEDIATOR :
 Get us but MESSIAH, THE PRINCE ; even now,
 in HIS pre-existent SPIRIT ; a branch of the
 HUMAN nature ; and THE SHEKINAH of THE
 invisible JEHOVAH : How gloriously shall we
 triumph ! For, depend upon this, nothing
 more true, than that THE invisible JEHOVAH,
 THE FATHER, is never backward to do ho-
 nour to THE SON ; whether we regard HIS
 PERSON, or HIS OFFICE, [Because, where THE
 SON is not honoured, THE FATHER himself is
the first to resent the affront.] He, therefore,
 THIS invisible JEHOVAH, takes every oppor-
 tunity to proclaim THE MESSIAH, even to the
 inhabitants of the upper world, as well as to
 those of this lower, as HIS only begotten SON¹ ;
 THE MAN *of his right hand*² ; THE MAN, HIS
 FELLOW³. Therefore, when, by raising him
 from the dead, *he brought, again,* HIS FIRST-
 BEGOTTEN *into the world,* he gave public orders
 above, saying : *Let all the angels of GOD wor-*
*ship him*⁴.

BUT, alas ! who have we here obtruded up-
 on us ? An angel, a creature only ; and he,
 the creature of THE MESSIAH ! What right,
 then, has this creature, either *to strip* THE
 ALMIGHTY, or *displace* THE MEDIATOR ?
 The attempt is not only an inroad on the na-
 ture of things, but also on sacred revelation ;
 and, therefore, condemns itself, by being men-
 tioned only.

¹ John i. 14.² Ps. lxxx. 17.³ Zech. xiii. 7.⁴ Heb. i. 6.

NOT that I mean by this, to thrust the archangel intirely out. No, *Michael*, with all my heart, shall have *his share* in the business of our world. He shall be *the first angel* under CHRIST. [If we are to suppose the superior orders of angels wholly unconcerned with our globe.] But, I shall always insist, that JEHOVAH be supreme in all transactions whatsoever; and that, next to him, MESSIAH, THE PRINCE, be allowed to take place: And, then, MESSIAH shall dispose of *Michael*, and all the *angelical* host, as he pleases. But to proceed,

2. PREPARATION being made, as above, for the security of the person of *Moses*; the next observable is: That JEHOVAH would give him *a signal*, immediately preceding the full accomplishment of this promise, not only, that he might not come upon him *unawares*, as we say; but also, that he might, by this means, heighten his attention, and rouse him to a more intense prospect. Hence it is, that JEHOVAH tells him, that, as a seasonable preparatory to his opening this glorious scene, he would not only *stand with, or before, him in the cloud*; but, in order to give him full warning both of *his presence*, and *speedy transit* (though of the latter especially) he would previously call-out: THE LORD, THE LORD, *is before thee*, &c.—Nor is this *introductory* proclamation, as I may term it, the whole, that JEHOVAH would do to gratify *Moses* in this case; for it follows,

3 and 4. As circumstances immediately connected : That he would *actually pass before him*, and, at that very instant, both *take away his hand*, and, by a second proclamation, *give forth HIS NAME*, in an audible manner, in all it's glorious fulness and variety. That, by this punctuality, he might not lose a moment in making the nicest observation, that the nature of THE DIVINE BEING, as A pure SPIRIT [yet here in a measure *veil'd* ;] and the circumstances of *Moses*, as a system of *mortality* ; would admit.—This, however, at the most, could be only his catching a transient view ; and, by no means, rise to a distinct, adequate sight : Which therefore leads me to observe,

5. In the last place, as the result of the whole transaction, and the full accomplishment of what JEHOVAH had here promised : That, though THE ALMIGHTY could not indulge him a sight of THE DIVINE GLORY in it's extreme splendor ; he should, however, have a more imperfect view of it : Such, for example, as may be represented, by our having *the glance* of a man only, as he passeth hastily before us ; and therefore gives us an opportunity, not of seeing *his face* so directly ; but, rather, *his back-parts*, or, as your lordship puts it, *what follows him*.

HAVING then, by what has been now advanced, not only acquired a general view of the contents of this passage ; but, likewise [in a qualified sense] admitted your lordship's *reading*, towards the close of it : my next business,

FIFTHLY,

FIFTHLY, Shall be to examine, how far the above state of things will lead us into a clear and scriptural explication of *the several characters*, which your lordship is pleased to bestow on *The delegated Jehovah*; but which [having first reserved THE FATHER's claim in them, as occasion requires] will be found, on examination, to center in THE MAN, CHRIST, as THE ONE MEDIATOR between GOD and us.

It will however, be necessary, before I enter on the illustration of the several characters themselves, just to take a retrospect of the situation, in which we left JEHOVAH and *Moses*, above, for the accomplishment of the promise in this text: Each appearing, *in emblem*, under a different; but, sharing, *in reality*, the same common preparation.—The reason, which renders the present review of consequence in this place, is: That, as we are now to contemplate both THE FATHER and CHRIST, in their relation to the reasonable, human creature; especially the religious part of the species; it is very obvious, that we are all of us so intimately concern'd in the amount of these several characters, that each of them, in their effects, will be found to point towards us, and terminate on us.

THE QUESTION, therefore, is: What is the true means of beholding these illustrious characters to the greatest advantage? that is to say, in such manner, as both to embolden ourselves most effectually for the prospect; and likewise to give them their strongest, and yet their
their

their most agreeable lustre? The return is: That we must, of necessity, gain such a position, that we may see them, as they break forth upon us from the MEDIATORIAL constitution. Which, in the *emblematical* language of this passage, is the same as saying: That we are to contemplate THE DIVINE BEING *in the pillar of cloud*, and Moses *in the cleft of the rock*. It is from hence only, that we can borrow the proper light for explaining all the characters of THE ONE GOD and THE ONE MEDIATOR. On this system alone, that we can venture the examination of our own broken circumstances; if we propose to ourselves such a prospect, as may give us just ground to hope, that THE DEITY will not only be propitious to us in this life, but crown us with eternal felicity in the next. Because, placing JEHOVAH and ourselves in this precise point of view, what is it, that we see? In respect to HIM, not a simple, absolute GOD; who, by the unerring dictates of scripture, is, and cannot but be, *a consuming fire* to every guilty descendant of *Adam*: But, on the contrary, we here behold THIS GOD in CHRIST; therefore taking up his residence in a branch of our nature, that he might give his mercy a glorious scope in our eternal salvation. And then, in respect to ourselves, what presents to us, is, no longer a guilty, apostate creature, sinking under the weight of his own sins; and therefore, shrinking into nothing under an apprehension of the divine law

law and justice, the divine purity and holiness; but, one of our own species, happily recovering *the shadow of that rock*, which is a covert from the wind, and an hiding-place from the tempest of God's wrath¹. In a word: We see here, the character and situation of the real Christian; *Moses, in the cleft of the rock*, representing, not his own state merely, in a spiritual light; but also, the state of the several individuals of the human nature, who are truly christian. So that taking this view along with us, we procede boldly to the examination of all those characters, which your lordship has made the property of *Michael* the archangel. Here then

I. THE FIRST, by which he stands distinguished in *The Essay*, is this: Namely, WHAT FOLLOW'D JEHOVAH. For (as I took the liberty of signifying above) my exceptions are level'd, more directly, against your lordship's application of these terms, than against *the terms themselves*. For the truth is: That tho' it be certainly possible, to put such a construction on these words, as to excuse *the version itself*; yet, I am really of opinion, that nothing can be offered, to excuse your lordship's *intention* in giving it. But to the character itself:

WHAT FOLLOW'D JEHOVAH. There is then nothing wanting for the illustration of these terms, in a consistency with the religion of JESUS, but only, that we make HIM THE SUB-

¹ Isa. xxxii. 2.

JECT of them; and therefore unfold their contents by this special reference: Yet, in such fort, as not to confine them, altogether, to CHRIST, *personally*; but, at the same time, to suppose, that *things* may, likewise, be included.—With regard then to the latter of these senses, we have here,

1. In the general, an extensive view of all the divine perfections, as they stand displayed in the works of creation, providence and grace: But, in more strict reference to the present occasion, we have, undoubtedly, a prospect of THE DIVINE NAME, in all those glorious particulars, which bespeak THE invisible JEHOVAH perfectly suited, in the first place, to the present circumstances of the *Jewish* church; and then, in the next, as equally suited to all the necessities of his people at large. And this, as THE DIVINE NAME appears to fall under that grand division, which proclaims THE ALMIGHTY, a being of consummate goodness on the one part, and of strict righteousness on the other. Because we shall find, that these two articles include the several branches, of what is here called THE NAME of THE LORD; and are the invariable peculiars of THAT NAME, when taken in it's full compass. The reason of which is, that the DIVINE majesty can no more renounce his punitive justice, where moral evil takes place; than he can forego the exercise of mercy, where that evil is expiated,

BUT

BUT the question returns: Where is it, that we have the clearest, and the only satisfactory view of these things? I answer: In WHAT FOLLOW'D JEHOVAH: Meaning, in that exhibition, which he has given us of these his glorious perfections in the person and undertakings of CHRIST. And this was a discovery much more to the present purpose, than if *Moses* could have had a full view of the DIVINE majesty in all the distinguishing splendor of his nature. Because he saw here, that rich fund of divine benevolence, which, besides leading him to hope, that he would both pardon their past transgression, and shortly restore *the visible tokens* of his presence to the *Jewish* camp; might likewise encourage him to believe, that he would graciously accept his continued intercession for them; and therefore give him room to conclude, that JEHOVAH would bear with them, where any future instance of perverseness might turn-up. At the same time, that he could not but inform himself, from the other particulars in THIS adorable NAME, that JEHOVAH would not neglect the proper opportunities of chastising their wicked inventions; having therefore declared, that *in the day when he visited, he would certainly visit their sin upon them*¹; yet, with such paternal tenderness, that *in visiting he would not make a full end of them, but in the midst of judgement remember mercy*². This, however, is only a

¹ Exod. xxxii. 34.
with Jerem. xxx. 11. and Hab. iii. 2.

² Ibid. ch. xxxiv. 7, compared

partial view of this character : I add therefore,

2. THAT, besides what presents from it, when explained in connexion with the state of the parties here originally concern'd, in reference to *things*, particularly those of spiritual import ; it is certain, that the character will likewise admit of accommodation to *the person* of CHRIST.^e And that, first, more strictly, as to *his production* : And, secondly, more at large, as to *his character* or *office*.—In the former case, CHRIST may be spoken of by the present terms : Because, as he is God's *only begotten* SON^r ; he must of necessity be one, THAT FOLLOW'D HIM. And, in the latter case : As he is God's *constitution*, *set-up from everlasting* ; he must be a person in that respect likewise, WHO FOLLOW'D JEHOVAH. GOD himself, as the first cause, is the fountain of being and power ; and therefore CHRIST, both as to *his person* and *office*, is a derivation from THE FATHER. In reference to which particulars, it is farther observable, that the text expressly stiles THE invisible JEHOVAH, both THE GOD and FATHER of CHRIST^r. What then will the amount be ? Plainly that, which we have seen all along : Namely, That *there is ONE GOD and ONE MEDIATOR* [THE MAN, CHRIST] inseparably connected ; that *there is ONE FATHER and ONE* [*only begotten*] SON ; ONE JEHOVAH and ONE MESSIAH, neither detached from the other ; but both invio-

¹ John i. 14.

² Eph. i. 3.

ably united in all the affairs of creation, providence and redemption: Therefore jointly carrying-on, not only all, that concerned *Israel* at this time; but all, that has since concerned the whole world, whether righteous or wicked. And, once more, still united to these great ends, for the ages to come; till such time as THE SON *shall deliver-up the* MEDIATORIAL *kingdom* to THE FATHER, and GOD *shall become all in all*¹: On which, I presume, a change of the divine administration, though not of the divine residence, is to succeed.

AND, as this agrees with the general testimony of scripture; so, with what the *Jewish* commentators have advanced on this head; which is: That "JEHOVAH is never to be "seen out of HIS SHEKINAH"². But, were it necessary to repeat the question, and ask: Who, or what, is THIS SHEKINAH? Former accounts will answer: Not a super-angelical nature; not *Michael*, the archangel; but a branch of the human nature [*with* THE FULLNESS OF THE GODHEAD *dwelling in him*] pre-existing, at the time we are now speaking of, in his human spirit; but, at the determined period, taking a body of the virgin. But, whether existent in his spirit only, or as a spirit embodied; one, who always stood charged with the concerns of the church: As well under the old testament, in his pre-existent spi-

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 24, 28.

² See *Ainsworth* on Exod.

rit ; as since, in his whole person, under the new ; in consequence of his rising THE TABERNACLE of THE DEITY. Wherefore, in the above view of things it is, that THE MAN, CHRIST, fully answers to the present character ; FOLLOWING the invisible JEHOVAH, not only from the first, in respect to the derivation of his person, and his investiture with office ; but also, as acting in perpetual subserviency to him, both for the conservation of all his works, and the execution of all his counsels. But that leads me more expressly to a subsequent character : For your lordship observes,

II. THAT this same person is called HIS, h. e. JEHOVAH'S, WAY ¹. — This, again, gives us a glorious view of THE MAN, CHRIST. [This term, CHRIST, it must be remembered, agreeable to a former hint ², includes not *the* MEDIATORIAL *unction* only ; but also *the* *inhabitation* of THE DEITY : And therefore speaks this person to be *the man* God's fellow, and, of course, infinitely above the mere creature : I say, this, again, gives us a glorious view of THE MAN, CHRIST] both as SON and MEDIATOR : Whether we consider him, as GOD'S WAY to us, or OUR WAY to GOD.

I. CHRIST is GOD'S WAY to us :

i.) AS to HIS PERSON. Because he is *his first*, as well as *his capital production* ; and, let me add, *the only one* of the kind.——In this

¹ Section lxiv.

² P. 15.

point it is, that we trace the rise, or spring, of all the external manifestations of THE DEITY towards us, or, rather, towards his creatures in general. [Which is, again, in itself, a sufficient reason, why we should keep *the* MEDIATORIAL person and the MEDIATORIAL constitution always in view; and therefore contemplate OUR LORD himself, and *universal nature*, in strict reference to, or connexion with, that system.] The first step, that ALMIGHTY GOD ever made, externally, for the display of his infinite personal perfections, was, the production, I am now speaking of; calling forth THE MAN, CHRIST, into existence. For this reason it is, that he stands described in holy scripture, as *the begining of the creation of God*¹, and *the first-born of every creature*²: Texts, which, I will venture to say, can admit of no explication, unless *his pre-existent spirit* be taken into the account. Again,

2). CHRIST is GOD'S WAY to us. Because, having, as above, produced HIS PERSON; he afterwards *set him up* as MEDIATOR. Wherefore, as by the first step, he made him HIS TABERNACLE, or fix'd his personal residence in him; so, by the next, he made him *the repository* of all power and grace: *The alone medium*, through which, he determined to exhibit himself in the works of creation, providence and redemption. Hence then we are to observe: That as there is nothing, which GOD

¹ See *Marginal Note*, p. 299. N^o THIRDLY. ² Rev. iii. 14.

³ Col. i. 15.

has to communicate, which he has not given to CHRIST: [For which reason OUR LORD saith: *All things, that THE FATHER hath (meaning the all, that is communicable) are mine: 1*] So, neither is there any thing, which the DIVINE being had, heretofore; or which he has yet, to effect; but what he then wrought, and still continues to work it, in and by him, THE SON. Thus making CHRIST HIS WAY at all times, and upon all occasions, for every manifestation of his power, and every communication of his grace.

WHEREFORE, for GOD to shew *Moses*, and, consequently, any of his intelligent creatures, HIS WAY, as that character terminates in CHRIST; is nothing less, than his giving both the one and the other of them, a delightful prospect of HIS NAME in all it's glorious variety: Such an extensive view of himself, as might assure them, that he is a comprehension of every thing, that may render him equal to their necessities in this life, and consummate their happiness in a future. Nor is this all, it being observable,

2. THAT CHRIST is not only JEHOVAH'S WAY to us; *a medium*, through which we behold all the perfections of THE DEITY, operating for our present and eternal welfare; but, that he is likewise OUR WAY to GOD: that, through him, we have equally *access* to, and *supplies* from, our common adorable parent, both in nature and grace. For CHRIST is *that*

¹ John xvi. 15.

new and living way, which ALMIGHTY GOD has consecrated to these great purposes¹; on the obstruction of the first way of approach to him, viz. that of an innocent nature. And through THIS WAY, we come boldly unto the throne of GRACE, to obtain mercy [for the pardon of our sins] and find grace [or strength] to help us in time of need². Hence, therefore, are those words of OUR SAVIOUR: I am THE WAY—no man cometh unto THE FATHER but by me³. In agreement with which, also, it is an observation of the Rabbins (making, in this case, a personal distinction between THE FATHER and CHRIST:) That “there is no coming before “the blessed and most high king without “SHEKINAH⁴”. But is THIS SHEKINAH a super-angelical nature? So intirely the reverse, that we are said to come through *the veil*, that is, *the flesh of CHRIST*⁵: Which flesh is either put for *the whole man*; or is, however, a certain proof: That as OUR SAVIOUR stood clothed with that body, which is peculiar to *the man*; so, that he likewise shared that soul or spirit, which alone distinguishes *the man*. Once more,

III, IV, and V. As your lordship stiles the GREAT subject before us, THE GLORY of JEHOVAH⁶; and it appears to me, that this term may be justly considered as a kind of general title, including within itself those other

¹ Heb. x. 20.² Ibid. ch. iv. 16.³ John xiv. 6.⁴ Ainsworth on Exod. xxxiv. 9.⁵ Heb. x. 20.⁶ §. lxiv.

characters,

characters, by which you speak of him as **THE SIMILITUDE, and IMAGE OF REPRESENTATIVE** of **THE** invisible **JEHOVAH** : I have taken the liberty of throwing them together under once common head ; apprehending, I may be allowed to treat them, at the same time, as carrying in them this one illustrious idea : Namely, that the personage here described, is *a very expressive resemblance* of all **DIVINE** excellencies. Nor can there be any thing more true, than this general representation of these several characters, when applied to the right subject : That is to say, to **THE MAN, CHRIST** ; considered, both as **THE SON of GOD**, in respect to *his person*, and as **THE ONE MEDIATOR**, in regard to *his office*. But, as your lordship interprets away the true person, by refering these characters to a super-angelical nature ; so is violence manifestly offered to the characters themselves, when you resolve them wholly into a matter of *commission*. Admit the proper subject, indeed ; and consider this subject in his two-fold capacity : *viz.* as **SON** and as **MEDIATOR** ; and the glorious amount of these attributes comes out immediately : But, in consequence of this plan, we shall by no means think it sufficient to assert, that **OUR LORD** acts, barely, *by the authority* of **THE** invisible **JEHOVAH** ; nor, again, that *the power* of **THE** invisible **JEHOVAH** is, merely, *a delegation* to him ; which is to denominate him **THE GLORY, THE SIMILITUDE, THE IMAGE OF REPRESENTATIVE** of **THE** invisible **JEHOVAH**,

in a very low sense of the words; and yet this is evidently the highest sense, in which these characters are affirmed of him by *The Essay*: No, besides taking the particulars above into the estimate, as matters of *secondary consideration*; we shall think ourselves obliged to look, principally, for the fundamental truth and propriety of these characters, into *the person of CHRIST*, as *the only begotten of THE FATHER*; that singular production, who is, at once, *THE TABERNACLE OF THE DIVINE BEING*, and *the man GOD's fellow*.

LET us view him therefore in the very structure of *his person*, as the first, the top branch of the human nature, with *THE FULLNESS OF THE GODHEAD dwelling in him BODILY*. But, if we can be certain, that *THE ONE GOD*, *THE invisible JEHOVAH*, is substantially resident in this branch of our nature; we may then, doubtless, hope, that we shall have it in our power to behold him *in this tabernacle*; to converse with him *through this medium*. But, if *THE ONE eternal JEHOVAH* is to be seen in *CHRIST*; it then follows of necessity, that *CHRIST* must be *THE GLORY*, *THE SIMILITUDE*, *THE IMAGE OF REPRESENTATIVE* of this *ONE eternal JEHOVAH*! For, say, what is there to hinder? If *GOD dwells there*, it is not, I presume, to conceal himself. It is not, surely, to veil his glories; or, to lie buried in obscurity: Intirely the reverse. And therefore that, shining forth through *CHRIST*, he may give the fulest, the clearest and strongest display

display of his person and perfections. But, if OUR SAVIOUR be *this medium* to THE EXCELLENT GLORY; shall not he, who reflects the whole of it, be justly stiled THE GLORY of THE invifible JEHOVAH? A GLORY, we had never beheld, but for the MEDIATORIAL constitution.—Shall not he, who, by virtue of this constitution, is become *the feat*, or *habitation*, of THE invifible JEHOVAH himfelf; and, of courfe, *the repository* of the perfections of his whole nature; with this exprefs defign likewife, that he might exhibit thofe perfections to the general view of angels and men: Shall not this perfonage, I fay, be juftly intitled to the feveral DIVINE characters, now under confideration? Shall not he be accounted THE REPRESENTATIVE of his very perfon, as well as THE MESSENGER of his counfels; who ftands in this clofe connexion with THE ALMIGHTY? and who answers all the glorious purpofes, laid-up in thefe titles, to the creatures of both worlds?—Suffer me to add: Here, or never, muft CHRIST rife *the brightnefs* of THE DIVINE GLORY, and *the exprefs image* of HIS FATHER's *perfon*. For which reafon, we are not only faid, to fee THE GLORY of GOD *in the face* [or perfon¹] of CHRIST²; but CHRIST himfelf tells *Philip*, that *he, who had feen him, had feen THE FATHER*³: meaning, not barely, *his authority*; but *his nature*; both as THE FATHER *dwelt* bodily *in him*, and as he him-

¹ Εὐ προσώπῳ.² 2 Cor. vi. 6.³ John xiv. 9.
felf

self was, emphatically, *the visible display* of all his glorious perfections. But to go on :

VI. THE GUARDIAN ANGEL of *Israel*, is, another character assign'd this personage by *The Essay* ¹.—I can then very readily allow this character, among the rest, to be a branch of CHRIST'S honour as MEDIATOR: Observing, however, at the same time, that it, by no means, belongs to him on the same principle of reasoning, on which, the business of *guardianship* is applied to created angels, in common. Because, as it has been allowed, that there were such powers as these, especially, during the old testament state of things; angels, in the literal sense of the word, expressly appointed by GOD or CHRIST, to preside over particular kingdoms: So, we are well assured, that this character, though strictly descriptive of office; was likewise so far an indication of their *metaphysical* nature, as to point us to that order of intelligent spirits, which is next above the human in the scale of mere creatures. Now, their title in this quality, we find, was, that of *chief princes*; in agreement with which, we read of the prince of *Persia*, and the prince of *Greece*; and likewise of *Michael*, as *the first of these chief princes*, and *the great prince, the guardian angel of Israel* ². Here, therefore, it will be observed, that *Michael* has his place; yet this, not as *a principal*, but as *a servant*; not as *the head* of the church, but *the minister*

¹ §. lxiii.

² See above, p. 91, &c.

of CHRIST. For, as has been already intimated, let *Michael* only keep his place, under CHRIST; and I shall have no objection to any honour, that may, properly, belong to him: Whether he act, *singly*, in his own person; or, whether he bring *his angels* along with him. It will therefore be remarked, that though we allow *Michael* to have been *the* guardian angel of *Israel* [meaning the *Mosaical* church;] yet, it is neither as he is the same person, nor a spirit of the same nature, with our SAVIOUR; that is, speaking of HIM by the name of THIS GUARDIAN ANGEL. For, as to *Michael*, I would hope, it has been already proved, that he is barely a created spirit; of the same *metaphysical* nature with those, who are called angels in the common acceptance of the term; only at the head of that order. Whereas, when we come to speak of CHRIST, as THE GUARDIAN ANGEL of *Israel*, he appears, not only to be personally distinct from him; as much as the creator of angels is distinct from the angels created; but to possess this character upon a very different principle: Namely, as the top branch of the human nature, with THE FULNESS of THE GODHEAD dwelling in him BODILY. Now

1. As to the former part of what is here asserted: *viz.* That our SAVIOUR is to be considered as A MAN, a branch of the human nature, with regard to the present character [THE GUARDIAN ANGEL of *Israel*;] will appear, I imagine, by looking into the description

cription given of him under the character of *an angel*. For example : It is observable,

1.) FIRST of all : That he is called THE ANGEL of the DIVINE presence : *In all their afflictions he was afflicted, and THE ANGEL of HIS PRESENCE saved them, &c.*^{*} The remarks here are,

(1.) THAT there was such an intelligent spirit, or person, as was called, emphatically, THE ANGEL of GOD'S PRESENCE. What then do these words mean ? Not, I imagine, that CHRIST ever stood, in common, with certain other created angels before the throne of GOD, as one of his ministers of state (though it were the principal) in like manner, as *Michael, Gabriel*, or any of the *chief princes*, or *first angels*, may be supposed to stand before GOD ; ready to receive and execute his divine commands, as he shall be pleased to deliver them². For, though it be certain, that OUR SAVIOUR, on account of his MEDIATORIAL charge, may be justly stiled *the prime minister* of heaven ; and therefore is ever ready to carry all the commands of HIS FATHER into immediate execution : Yet, would it be greatly to degrade him, in point of *personal dignity*, were we to consider him, in this capacity, as standing directly at the same distance from ALMIGHTY GOD, and receiving his orders in the same common way, with the several chief angels, his creatures. What, therefore, is to be done ?

^{*} Isa. lxiii. 9.
p. 41, &c. Fol. Ed.

² See *Mede* on Zech. iv. 10.

Doubtless,

Doubtless, he is to be looked-upon, as THE ANGEL of the DIVINE presence, in such sort: That all the dictates of the divine breast are to be considered, both as communicated to him immediately, and then, as given out by him to his ministers, the created angels. Nor so only: But we are here, I imagine, to regard him chiefly, as THE SEAT of all the DIVINE counsels; as A PARTNER with THE ALMIGHTY in the first rise, and, likewise, as A PRINCIPAL in the execution, of all the schemes of his providence and grace: Therefore appearing in this work, on a variety of occasions, under the old testament, in the person; and performing the ministerial services of *an angel*: Either for the direction and preservation of the church, in general; or the discharge of certain good offices to individual patriarchs, in particular. He is therefore *the lamb* in THE MIDST of the throne: He is THE SHEKINAH, or TABERNACLE, of THE ONE GOD. And therefore his principal claim to the present character, must be considered, as founded in this near and intimate relation to THE FATHER himself: In his being *the PERSONAL reflection* of THE FATHER'S glory; HIS SIMILITUDE, IMAGE, or REPRESENTATIVE: Acting under this character, as was just now remarked, not at the distance of others, the created angels; but as having the same common interest at heart with THE FATHER: And, therefore, by

virtue of *the* DIVINE *inhabitation*, becoming throughout A PRINCIPAL, OR PARTNER, with THE invisible JEHOVAH.

BUT, if CHRIST, as THE ANGEL *of the* DIVINE *presence*, rise to us in this light, or lay claim to the present character on this principle; the inquiry returns: What is *the throne, seat or habitation* of ALMIGHTY GOD? Where is it, that THE DIVINE BEING has fixed *his substantial residence*? Who is that person, among the various orders of intelligent spirits, in whom, he has been pleased to *collect himself*, both for the disclosing his mind, at first; and then for carrying all his divine purposes into execution? To these questions, former accounts will return a full answer. It being clear to a demonstration, that THE MAN, CHRIST, is this distinguished person. Should it, however, be here again disputed, I have then farther to observe:

(2.) THAT the other part of the text now before us, describing this person by HIS AFFECTIONS, will give us full satisfaction in the point. For it is said: *In his love and in his pity he redeemed them.* But where shall we find *these affections and passions* with a super-angelical nature? The supposition admits of no possibility. Because, as has been shewn in another place¹, there wants *that community* of nature, which is necessary, to make him capable of, or sensible to, *the feelings and infirmities* of

¹ See above, p. 61, &c. p. 165. and 187.

the human species. Wherefore, as THIS ANGEL of the DIVINE *presence* was so form'd, as to be in a capacity of *pitying* and *condoling* with the old-testament church under their various afflictions; and likewise of *being griev'd* at their intollerable perverseness and frequent back-slidings; it, undoubtedly, proves (as the expressions, on the plan here laid-down, may be all taken, in a proper, or literal sense;) that he is a branch of our nature, and not super-angelical: And, therefore, that the person, intended by this character, is CHRIST, the head of the human nature; and therefore, again, one personally distinct from *Michael*, the archangel.

IF it be objected here, as it, probably, may: That I have, in fact, mistaken the true application of *the above passions* and *affections*. For that, instead of their being referable to CHRIST, as *the ANGEL of GOD's presence*; they are, on the contrary, strictly referable to the DIVINE majesty himself, as the person spoken-of, both in the beginning of the verse, and likewise in the context.—Be it so. It will, however, be immediately granted: That this DIVINE majesty, is, in his abstract nature, infinitely rais'd above all those emotions, which we express by the words *love*, *pity*, *grief* and the like. What I have then farther to beg, is, that, since affections of this kind are affirmed of him, with regard to the human species; it may be considered, whether there be not some principle, which will warrant us in applications of this
fort,

fort, with a degree of *propriety*. And what other can this be, but *that strict connexion*, which obtains between the DIVINE and MEDIATORIAL persons? And on this principle, there is apparently the same reason for applying *the affections* of the human nature to JEHOVAH himself; as there is for applying *the attributes* of THE DEITY to THE MAN, CHRIST¹. The necessary conclusion from which, cannot but turn-out in favour of the present argument. For as much as it will still appear, on this plan of reasoning: That CHRIST, as THE ANGEL of the DIVINE presence, and THE TABERNACLE of THE ONE GOD, must needs be a branch of *humanity*, and not a *super-angelical essence*.—This then is the first auxiliary description, leading us into the general contents of OUR LORD's character, as THE GUARDIAN ANGEL of *Israel*; and that, wherein he appears to answer to *Jacob's* account of him, when he calls him THE ANGEL *that REDEEMED me*, &c. Again,

2.) THIS same glorious personage is also called, THE ANGEL of THE COVENANT²: Which cannot but mean, in the plain, obvious sense of the words, that person, who was *set-up*, as MEDIATOR, *from everlasting*³; and who enter'd into a solemn compact with THE DIVINE BEING or FATHER, for the redemption of mankind. But, I have already shewn, that none, but a branch of that

¹ See above, p. 222.
viii. 23.

² Mal. iii. 1.

³ Prov.

nature, which is *a medium* in the scale of created being, can possess that PERSONAL structure, which is alone suited to the present important charge ¹. For as much then as CHRIST, and not *Michael*, is that person, who was given *for* a covenant of *the people*, from before the foundation of the world ²; and who, in consequence of that eternal engagement, submitted, immediately on the transgression of our first parents; and, afterwards, down, through the old testament period; to take upon him the appearance, title, and ministry of *an angel*: It evidently appears, that *this character*, among the rest, bears full testimony to his being a branch of the human nature. Once more,

3.) WE read farther of this same person, as THAT ANGEL, *which spake to Moses in the mount Sinai* ³. Now, there are but two ways, I apprehend, in which this character can be explained; that is to say: Either, first, of ALMIGHTY GOD. Or, secondly, of OUR blessed SAVIOUR. Wherefore,

(1.) SUPPOSING we refer it to the former of these persons. It is then, as far as I can see, to be accounted for in this manner: Namely, that as JEHOVAH here submits to *the appearance and work of an angel* [coming down, as we speak, and declaring his mind to *Moses*, in his own person:] So, he may very justly be spoken of under the character of *an angel*, h. e. *a messenger* ⁴. But,

¹ See above, p. 19, &c.

² Isa. xlii. 6. Prov. viii. 23.

³ Acts vii. 38.

⁴ See above, p. 283, &c.

(2.) IF

(2.) IF we refer it to CHRIST: The character cannot but suit him, because he is properly THE ANGEL of the DIVINE presence; the person, in whom JEHOVAH resides, and the mouth, by which he spake to *Moses*: as before this, *out of the bush*; so now, likewise, *in the mount*.—And, indeed, this state of the subject manifestly includes a good reason for the character's being applied to God himself; as it is, in reality, no other than THE ALMIGHTY GOD speaking by HIS ANGEL, or through HIS SHEKINAH; and that in *Midian*¹, as well as on *Sinai*.—The consequence then of the whole is this: *viz.* That whether we explain this character of THE FATHER or CHRIST; there is, on both sides, an higher and a lower nature jointly concern'd: proving therefore, on the one hand, that OUR GOD is not an absolute, simple DIVINITY; and, on the other, that OUR SAVIOUR is not *a bare man*, at the distance of a mere creature from THE ALMIGHTY; but THE MAN CHRIST; THE MAN, THE TABERNACLE of THE invisible JEHOVAH. And on this principle it, undoubtedly, is [a principle, that will carry us through all descriptions of this kind;] that St. *Stephen* now speaks of him under the character of *an angel*. It being evident, that he here applies this character expressly to OUR SAVIOUR.

¹ APPLY this, with the remainder of the paragraph, to page 294, where the apparition *in the bush* is referred more directly to CHRIST.

AND, without taking this lower nature along with us, there is no method of accounting for that familiar, continued access, which *Moses* had to **JEHOVAH** himself. Because, take away *the veil* of **CHRIST**'s humanity, as a *middle nature*, and **THE ALMIGHTY** dwells in that light, which is inaccessible. He could not, therefore, have held this intimate converse with *Moses*, had he not been pleased, *by this medium*, to allay the more tremendous glories of his nature. But, that he did take this method, has likewise been shewn above: Where it was observed, that **ALMIGHTY GOD** not barely on occasion of proclaiming **HIS NAME** to *Moses*; but also on every other occasion, *descended in the cloud*, and talked with him out of *the cloud*: **THAT CLOUD** being, evidently, a strong and beautiful emblem of **CHRIST**, as a branch of our nature; nor of that separately, but also of **THE GODHEAD**, *dwelling BODILY in him*: Since a constitution of this kind, must be allowed, the only true means of **God's** accommodating himself, not only to *Moses'* weakness in particular, for the converse refer'd to in the text; but likewise to the circumstances of the human, reasonable creature in general. But this brings me,

2. To the other branch of my assertion: Namely, that to complete the character of **THIS ANGEL**, we are to consider **THE IN-DWELING GODHEAD**, as a part inseparable from his nature or person.—Now, to evidence this, it will be proper, to take notice of
a par-

a particular or two in the account, which THE invisible JEHOVAH himself gives us of CHRIST, as THIS GUARDIAN ANGEL of *Israel*, when he speaks of conducting them to the promised land by HIS ANGEL. The passage, I refer to, is this: *Behold! I send AN ANGEL before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place, which I have prepared. Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not: For he will not pardon your transgressions: FOR MY NAME IS IN HIM*¹. And again, verse 23d: *For MINE ANGEL shall go before thee, and bring thee in unto The Amorites, &c.* Here the remarks, I have more especially to make, are these:

1.) THE SOLEMN CHARGE, that THE invisible JEHOVAH gives *The Israelites* to revere the person, and observes the dictates of THIS ANGEL: *Beware of him, and obey his voice.* Now, as THE CHARGE is, in itself, apparently awful; so we need only attend,

2.) THE REASON on which it is urged, to convince us of *the superior dignity* of the person, who was to be the object of their present fear and obedience. THE REASON then is: *For he will not pardon your transgressions.*—In regard to *the transgressions* here refer'd to, and *the pardon* adequate to them; I suppose, it will, in general, be allow'd: That by *transgressions* in this place, we are not so directly to understand *common offences* between man and man, or *the general injuries*, that we are liable

¹ Exod. xxiii. 20, 21.

to receive, one from another ; but, more immediately, *offences of an higher nature* ; such, for instance, wherein the DIVINE majesty is more especially concern'd : And therefore, more expressly, in reference to *The Jews*, the word may intend, that capital sin of *idolatry*, to which they were so exceedingly addicted. Or, supposing we may be allowed to extend the expression, and to understand it of *all moral evil* in general ; the inquiry will be : Who is the majesty, principally, or supremely, offended ? Undoubtedly, that majesty, whose creatures we are, and whose laws we are therefore obliged to obey. But, if every transgression is, in the first and highest sense, a trespass against the majesty of heaven ; if they are his laws [strictly] that we break, and if it be at his bar [supremely] that we stand answerable for these instances of iniquity : See we not, at once both WHAT *the pardon* is, that we want ; and also who is THE PERSON with whom the *first power* to pardon is lodg'd ? If we are sinners before GOD, it is, certainly, *his mercy*, that we are to implore : Because that person only can pardon a trespass, against whom the trespass is committed.

BUT, it is said of THIS ANGEL, as the reason why they should *fear him* and *serve him* ; that HE *would not pardon their transgressions* : And THIS ANGEL, we say, is CHRIST. The farther question therefore is : How can CHRIST share any part in distributing *this pardon* ; if, according to the principles here laid down, he

is so far from being a super-angelical nature, that he is, as I contend, a branch of the human species?—The fact, however, is true. CHRIST *did pardon sin* in the days of his flesh. —And as to *the ratio*, or manner of the thing; it is to be observ'd: That he has A RIGHT to *pardon sin*, and *does pardon* it,

(1.) BECAUSE, wherever he is, there also is THE true eternal JEHOVAH, always IN HIM, and present WITH HIM. Here, therefore, super-added to his MEDIATORIAL qualifications, we have the person on the spot, in defiance of whom [supremely] all moral evil is perpetrated. We have here present the fountain of being, the source of all creative power, the original legislator, dwelling in CHRIST, a branch of our nature, and therefore not only giving authority to all *his words*; but *acting himself*, directly, through him, *in his own right*.— But this is not all. Farther to account for the interest THIS ANGEL has in the remission of sin, and therefore to bring it nearer to CHRIST himself, of whom the text, without doubt, *personally* speaks, it is necessary, it should be observed:

(2.) THAT, in consequence of *the* above *inhabitation* of THE GODHEAD, before all worlds; THIS same ANGEL is likewise to be consider'd, as having *personal interest* in the production of the reasonable creature; for the text saith: THE FATHER *created all things by CHRIST* *. Or, if that be thought less pe-

* Eph. iii. 9.

remptory, it is declared once and again : That *all things were created by him*¹, whether they be *things in heaven*, or *things on earth*². But, if CHRIST is to be look'd-upon as A PRINCIPAL with THE FATHER³ in the work of cre-

¹ John i. 3.² Col. i. 16.

³ PERHAPS, the doctrine of TWO PRINCIPALS, here again introduced, may seem as *mysterious* to some, as the doctrine of TWO, OR MORE, CO-EQUALS. Be that, as it will. This I very well know : That OUR LORD is to be consider'd as SON over *his own house*, and that the rest, whether *men*, or *angels*, are only *servants in it*. [Heb. iii. 5, 6. and ch. i. 14.] And, again, I cannot but observe : That there are TWO [distinct] PERSONS, THE ONE GOD and THE ONE MEDIATOR : Or, as OUR SAVIOUR expresses it, THE FATHER, whom he calls THE only true GOD ; and JESUS CHRIST, who is sent by THE FATHER, *John xvii. 3* : That there are these two persons] who bear the same names ; who perform the same works, and who are spoken of in holy scripture, as the joint objects of prayer and thanksgiving.—The difficulty is, to account for this process. Will nothing then satisfy us, without an intimate acquaintance with its *modus* ? I confess, I see no expedient for it, at present, unless we may be allow'd to resolve it into THE INHABITATION OF THE GODHEAD ; so often mention'd in the course of these sheets, and so strongly inculcated in the sacred records. And why is not this sufficient ? *Husband* and *wife*, we know, *are one* ; bear the same names ; perform the same works. How do we undertake to account for it ? By virtue of an union of persons [not a personal union.] Is not then the same principle applicable here ? Still, however, in such sort, that, as the husband is the head of the wife ; so, GOD is the head of CHRIST, 1 Cor. xi. 3.

AND what is there, in this, that we see not every day, in matters concerning the commercial life ? where there may be SEVERAL PRINCIPALS in gradual subordination to each other, and all of them dependent on one, as *supreme*. How, for example, can it be otherwise, where it happens, that *father* and *son* are in joint partnership ?

HERE, again, the case is the same, as in the similitude of the sun inclos'd in a globe of crystal. We may readily distinguish them [the contents and the case] as to their nature ; at the same time, that their influence or operation, as the result of their intimate connexion ; must be acknowledg'd common or united,

ation ;

ation; so must he likewise in *the structure of those laws*, which affect the reasonable creature: The consequence of which argument must be, that he is also to be acknowledg'd as *a party actually offended* in the violation of these laws. They are therefore HIS LAWS, as well as THE FATHER'S. And as he is *the framer*, so is he likewise *the guardian* of them. Wherefore taking these several particulars into the account, and observing withal, that he is that DIVINE personage, who, by his very nature, always *loved righteousness* and *hated iniquity*; the conclusion, which necessarily follows, is: That, consider'd as a person thus *acting with, and for God*; and, let me add, *for himself*, at the same time; he cannot, on these various accounts, *pardon transgressions*, without giving scope to proper resentment and correction. But, if this be not sufficient to evince an absolute connexion between THE eternal JEHOVAH and THE MAN, JESUS CHRIST; and therefore to prove, that he is THE ANGEL expressly refer'd to in this passage; I have to observe,

3.) THAT the above reason is back'd by *such another reason*, as cannot fail demonstrating the matter in dispute. Because, if it should be asked, more particularly, and in consequence of farther declarations in the text itself: WHY would not THIS ANGEL pardon their transgressions? JEHOVAH himself answers by saying: FOR MY NAME IS IN HIM.——I am

! Heb. i. 9.

very

very sensible, the utmost your lordship makes of this account, is: "He will not pardon your transgressions, for my name of *Jehovah* is in him". Which your lordship again explains by asserting, that THE invisible JEHOVAH "had proclaimed him *Jehovah*"; and by describing him as "an angel acting in his stead, and by his authority"¹.

BUT, besides that it has been shewn above, that JEHOVAH was, in fact, *proclaiming his own name*, and not *the name of another*²; excepting only, that OUR SAVIOUR is so far concern'd in the account, as that he is THE SHEKINAH of THE invisible JEHOVAH, and *the medium* of all external manifestations on the part of GOD: It is to be farther observed, that, when your lordship resolves the whole reasoning in this place, into a matter of *delegated power*, you must not certainly have fully attended to the *scriptural* use of that term [NAME] when thus assumed by, or attributed to, THE invisible GOD. Because, we shall find, that when THE ALMIGHTY saith: MY NAME IS IN HIM, the true import of the phrase is: I, MYSELF, AM IN HIM. So that THE NAME of GOD, in this text, I am humbly of opinion, is put for GOD HIMSELF, personally considered³. To this purpose is the word used by *Solomon*: THE NAME OF THE LORD, *b. e.* God himself, is a *strong tower*⁴. And again by the prophet *Isaiah*: *Behold!* THE NAME OF THE LORD

¹ *Essay*, §. lxiv.
Comment. on *Isa.* lxiii. 9.

² See p. 333, &c.
⁴ *Prov.* xviii. 10.

³ See *Lowth's*

[God

[God himself] *cometh from far, burning with his anger*¹. Thus likewise we read of *calling on THE NAME of THE LORD*²; that is, invoking; or praying to, GOD HIMSELF; of *exalting HIS NAME*³, and *giving the glory due to HIS NAME*⁴: with many other places in holy scripture.

FROM hence then it appears, that the capital or prime reason, why this person, who is here called AN ANGEL, would not pardon their transgressions, was not, barely, as your lordship puts it: *viz.* Because he was *the similitude, image, or representative* of JEHOVAH. Which intends, in your sense of those words: Merely, because he acted *by his authority, and by a power delegated* to him from THE JEHOVAH of hosts. Because, though this be, certainly, a part of OUR LORD's honour, as MEDIATOR; yet is it only a part, and of secondary consideration. The truth of this will readily appear, when we only come to remember; that the glory of CHRIST's person, and therefore a yet-stronger reason, why he hates, and cannot but punish sin, is: That THAT BEING, who is the fountain of holiness, and, of course, A GOD of purer eyes than to behold iniquity⁵, without correcting it, was absolutely resident IN HIM: Giving him, therefore, a part, as in his nature; so, likewise, in his spirit or temper. Nor is this all: For, as was observed above, a farther reason in this case is: That as JEHOVAH had taken THE MAN, CHRIST,

¹ Isa. xxx. 27.

² Joel ii. 32.

³ Ps. xxxiv.

⁴ Ibid. xxix. 2.

⁵ Hab. i. 13.

into the closest union with himself; he had, consequently, made him *an actual party* with himself in the affair. Wherefore, as, in the first place, to sin against God, was, likewise, to sin against CHRIST; so, in the next, to sin against CHRIST, was, at the same time, to sin against God.

THIS then, I apprehend, is the grand principle of reasoning made use of in the text. And, as it is, certainly, the foundation of the several other reasons, it not only points us to the dignity of CHRIST's person, above all created angels; but leads us to an easy solution of what is here affirmed of him, in reference to moral evil. — The argument, however, may probably receive some additional evidence by observing,

4.) LASTLY, agreeable to what has been already remarked: That there is nothing, which ALMIGHTY GOD has either *threaten'd*, or *promis'd*, on the part of THIS ANGEL in the text now before us; which he has not, likewise, in other places, *taken upon himself*, as his own proper business: In consequence of which, it is very clear, that he makes the whole of *this guardianship* common to himself with THIS ANGEL'. And this, not barely as A PRINCIPAL and *his minister*; but as TWO PARTIES, having joint interest in what is now carrying-on.

THUS, with respect to what is *threaten'd*, together with the reason of it, JEHOVAH says, on occasion of their idolatry: *I will not go-up*

² See above, p. 331, &c.

in the midst of thee ¹. And wherefore? Because the purity of his nature would oblige him to animadvert on their wickedness with a severity equal to that, which is here attributed to THIS ANGEL. For, as it is declared of THIS ANGEL, that *he would not pardon their transgressions*; so, JEHOVAH declares concerning himself, that he declined going with them [speaking, it may be, principally, on their own notions, as AN absolute GOD] *lest he should consume them* ². Being, however, after this, remarkably appeased by the intercession of *Moses*; how does the case stand on the other, meaning *the promisory part*? The declaration, with regard to THE ANGEL, we know, is as follows: MINE ANGEL *shall go before thee, and bring thee in unto The Amorites, &c.* ³. In perfect agreement with which, we find THE incomprehensible JEHOVAH condescending to charge himself with *the same work* [here, however, obliging us to turn our eyes on *his situation in CHRIST*;] saying therefore directly: *Behold! I drive-out before thee The Amorites, &c.* ⁴.

FROM hence, then, it is easy to observe: That as the accounts are *the same for substance*; so, that *the same parties* still come into view: leading us therefore into an easy return to this question: How would JEHOVAH HIMSELF drive-out *The Canaanite, &c*? The answer to this is: Not *immediately* (in the strict accepta-

¹ Exod. xxxiii. 3.
23.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid. ch. xxiii.

⁴ Ibid. ch. xxxiv. 11.

tion of that word;) not *by himself*, as AN absolute DEITY; but *ministerially*, that is, in the first and highest sense of the word, BY CHRIST, the angel of his presence; yet not BY CHRIST, as a *mere instrument* or *minister*; but as he himself was IN CHRIST, and as they BOTH acted *in mutual concert*.

WHAT then, is the evident conclusion from the whole? Certainly, I apprehend, that ALMIGHTY GOD would never speak of THIS ANGEL by *that name*, which is originally peculiar to himself; that he would never allow him *joint efficiency* in the same works; would never describe him as a person of *the same immaculate nature* with himself; nor, in the last place, make it the duty of *The Israelites* to pay him *that obedience and reverence*, which is manifestly his own DIVINE prerogative: I repeat it, THE invisible JEHOVAH would never have exhibited THE ANGEL, we are now speaking of, in this distinguished manner, had he been merely *a created angel*, with nothing to recommend him but a certain quantity of *delegated power*: Or, had he not been, on the contrary, that person, who is elsewhere denominated HIS SHEKINAH, TEMPLE OR HABITATION; THE MAN, in whom he has taken-up his PERSONAL residence.

BUT, if THE FATHER and CHRIST are, in this manner, ONE¹; *in name and disposition, in operation and interest*; is it not readily seen, that as their aversion to moral evil, and their love

¹ John x. 30.

of moral purity; must be one; so, that THE invisible JEHOVAH might say, as justly of THIS ANGEL, as he could of HIMSELF, PERSONALLY: *He will not pardon your transgressions?* And that because, to offend THIS ANGEL, was, to offend JEHOVAH himself. And wherefore? unless it be, that JEHOVAH himself resides IN HIM, and is ever present WITH HIM.

NOT but to offend THIS ANGEL, which is CHRIST, when things are duly considered, is, in fact, *a double offence*. Because, it is not only to offend GOD HIMSELF simply, or GOD in his own person; but it is also to offend him, again, in that person, who is HIS WAY, HIS IMAGE, HIS [objective] GLORY, &c; it is to offend GOD in the MEDIATORIAL person, and therefore to offend both HIM and HIS CONSTITUTION: An injury offer'd to CHRIST, as well as HIMSELF; and therefore such, as by offering violence to his establishments, strikes immediately at all the prerogatives of the DIVINE nature. So that, as in this view of the question, the offence appears *doubly aggravated*, it contains an additional reason, why *The Israelites* might not hope to transgress with impunity.

BUT to close this branch of the subject: As it appears from what has been now suggested, that THE DIVINE BEING had condescended to unite himself so intimately with THE MAN, CHRIST, as to make him both *the seat* of his PERSONAL residence, and *an efficient* with himself in all external operations; it is no wonder,

der, that an interchangeable use of all character between them, should succede: Consequently, therefore, that, among the rest, the title, now under consideration, which bespeaks him THE GUARDIAN ANGEL of *Israel*, should, by ALMIGHTY GOD, be applied directly to CHRIST; and then in, and through CHRIST, to THE one invisible JEHOVAH. For, thus it apparently turns out, that *the lower nature and ministry* of CHRIST, is as necessary to GOD's sharing this character, on the one part; as *the inhabitation, and perpetual presence* of THE DEITY, is to CHRIST's obtaining it, on the other. The consequence of which, as things appear to me, is: That we cannot destroy the connexion on either part, but the character, on both, equally subsides. I procede now,

VII. To a view of the next character, which presents from *The Essay*, namely: THE GOD of ISRAEL'. This your lordship founds on a relation, which *Moses* gives us of his ascent to the mount with *Aaron, Nadab, Abihu* and seventy of the *Jewish* elders. Here then,

I. THE FIRST thing to be considered, is, *the occasion or reason* of this character, ISRAEL. Because, when that point is once settled, it will be no difficult matter, I apprehend, to determine in the present question. And of this the accounts are two only: First, where it was originally imposed by THE MAN, with whom *Jacob* wrestled near the ford *Jabbok*. For he

¹ Section lxi, lxii, lxy.

then

then said to him: *Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel, &c*¹. And, secondly, where this change is renewed, or confirmed, by THE GOD of *Beth-el*, after his return from *Padan-aram*. For GOD there said unto him: *Thy name shall not be called any more Jacob, but Israel shall be thy name: And he called his name Israel*².—From hence then it appears, that this name was originally given to one single patriarch, namely, *Jacob* only; but from him, agreeable to the laws of nature, it descended to his posterity. So that that person, who was, at first, THE GOD of the father, individually; was afterwards pleased to distinguish himself by the same character to his children, collectively: They being called *Israelites*, after their father; and he calling himself, in respect to the whole *Jewish* nation, THE GOD of *Israel*.

NOW this being the original of the name itself, what we farther want, is, an acquaintance with the person or persons, who honoured *Jacob* with this appellation. It has then, I imagine, been fully proved in the above sheets, that by THIS MAN, in the former place, we are to understand THE MAN, CHRIST; as that branch of the human nature, where THE FULNESS OF THE GODHEAD dwells BODILY: And that, by THE GOD of *Beth-el*, in the latter text, no other than JEHOVAH himself is intended; yet not separately,

¹ Gen. xxxii. 28.

² Ibid. ch. xxxv. 10.

but in connexion with HIS SHEKINAH: To which explications, therefore, I must beg leave to refer for fuller evidence in these particulars¹.

It is, however, from hence observable, that, if we consider the present character, THE GOD of *Israel*, as the property of CHRIST, who, on this occasion, is likewise called AN ANGEL: It is certain, we must be obliged, by the structure of the MEDIATORIAL person, to take THE indwelling DEITY along with us. As, again, on the other part, if we apply this character to THE invisible JEHOVAH; we must also be obliged, by that situation, which he has placed himself in, on the plan of revelation; to consider him as dwelling in, and exhibiting himself through, THE MAN, CHRIST, *his tabernacle or temple*. So that SUPREME DIVINITY must always attend the character, wherever it be applied: The whole affair still lying between GOD and CHRIST. While in the character of CHRIST, as THIS MAN or THIS ANGEL, we see a foundation laid for all lower ascriptions; and, in the other, THE GOD of *Beth-el*, an equal foundation laid for securing all those, which are superior.

BUT, if this be a true state of the case; if THAT DIVINITY, which is both *eternal* and *supreme*, have interest in this character; it cannot be, that WHAT FOLLOW'D JEHOVAH, and SO FOLLOW'D HIM, as to be properly *an appendage* of himself, both as to *personal residence* and *external operation*; it cannot be, that a constitution of this kind should terminate in the arch-

¹ See abvo, p. 254—281.

angel *Michael*. Because he is by your lordship confessedly allow'd, to be no more than *a mere creature*. Whereas THE GOD of *Israel*, in the above view of things, appears to be either GOD in CHRIST, or CHRIST in GOD. However, to throw farther light on this subject, let us now,

2. IN the next place, take a view of THIS GOD of *Israel*, as he appears on the occasion here refer'd to by your lordship; and this, both in your representation of the matter, and in that given us by holy scripture.

1.) Now the *scriptural* account of the affair is this: That *Moses* having received orders from JEHOVAH to come-up into the mount, and to bring with him *Aaron* and *Nadab* and *Abihu* and seventy of the elders of *Israel*¹; he accordingly ascended in company with them: And it is said on this occasion, that *they saw* THE GOD of *Israel*². It is, however, observable, first: That the others were not permitted that near access to JEHOVAH, which *Moses* was indulged; that being part of the original orders³. And, farther, secondly: That, in consequence of this distance, they had not the same view of him, which *Moses* was allowed. Because JEHOVAH spoke to him, in common, *face to face, as a man speaketh to his friend*⁴: Whereas, judging in this case by accounts at the 10th verse, it appears, that they had only *a magnificent representation* [without any personal form] of THE GOD of *Israel*, having under

¹ Exod. xxiv. 1.
ver. 2.

² Ibid. ver. 9, 10.
³ Ib. ch. xxxiii. 11.

⁴ Ibid.

his feet, as it were, a paved work of a sapphire stone, and, as it were, the body of heaven in his clearness.

2.) As to what your lordship represents on this head, it stands thus: *Moses* and *Aaron* and *Nadab* and *Abihu* and seventy of the *Jewish* elders, are said to see THE GOD of *Israel*: Nevertheless, after this, GOD tells *Moses*, when he desired a sight of HIS GLORY, that no man could see HIS FACE, and live.

“ Whence, says your lordship, it is manifest,
 “ that this *Jehovah*——whose Face could not
 “ be seen, whom no man could see and live,
 “ could not be the invisible *Jehovah*; but the
 “ *Jehovah* who followed the invisible *Jehovah*,
 “ and was probably the same Person with that
 “ God of *Israel*, who was seen by *Moses* and
 “ *Aaron*, and *Nadab* and *Abihu*, and the
 “ seventy Elders of *Israel*. ”——The whole
 then that we are here concerned with, is, to
 examine how this conclusion comes out from
 your lordship's premises; and this, I apprehend,
 may be fully done, by putting the whole sub-
 ject into the subsequent form of words:
 Namely: “ Because neither *Moses*, nor any
 “ man, in a state of mortality, ever did, or
 “ can see, THE FACE, h. e. *the heavenly glory*,
 “ of GOD; therefore *Moses* himself was, and
 “ all of us must be, while mortal, wholly
 “ precluded every vision of THE ALMIGHTY.
 “ Consequently then, to bring it more direct-
 “ ly down to the matter in dispute: When we

“ are told concerning *Moses* and the present
 “ company, that they actually *saw* THE GOD
 “ of ISRAEL [which, by the way, I shall
 “ prove to be the character of the JEHOVAH
 “ of *hosts* ;] it means, in reality, that they were
 “ so far from having any particular sight of
 “ the DIVINE BEING himself, that, on the
 “ contrary, they saw nothing but a *created in-*
 “ *telligence*, personally distinct from THE true
 “ JEHOVAH : That is, instead of seeing THE
 “ ALMIGHTY, they saw only *the archangel*”.

——And why this substitution ? Only that,
 “ because we cannot *see* GOD *fully* in this life,
 “ we can therefore have *no sight of him at all*”.

——Where the force of this reasoning lies,
 your lordship will doubtless judge on a review
 of it in this light.——Nor is, what has been
 now suggested, the whole mystery in the case,
 neither ; but we must be forced, it seems, “ to
 “ *disbelieve* the reality of all such visions
 “ [meaning, those of JEHOVAH himself] tho’
 “ delivered down to us by the express dictates
 “ of that oracle, which speaks from heaven”.

——And thus *Michael* is ever to supplant THE
 ALMIGHTY !

HOWEVER, fully to invalidate every suppo-
 sition of this kind, permit me to subjoin as
 follows: *viz.*

(1). THAT though it were granted, as is
 readily done, that it was not THE invisible JE-
 HOVAH, neither in *his pure essence*, nor in *his*
heavenly glory, that *Moses*, and the rest, now
 saw ; because it is certain, that he is not visi-
 ble in either of those senses to creatures in a

state of mortality; [nor *in his pure essence*, I apprehend, to any created being whatever;] yet must it, nevertheless, be denied, that the person, whom they beheld, on this occasion, was *Michael*, the archangel: Because they could not possibly see any less [or other] person, than CHRIST, THE MEDIATOR. But CHRIST, THE MEDIATOR, as I have shewn in the course of this letter, being a branch of the human species, and not super-angelical; *Michael* is, of necessity, disqualified, by his very nature, from being the person concerned in the present appearance. Again,

(2.) BESIDES it's being contrary to *the nature of things* to suppose, that *Michael* is THIS GOD of *Israel*; it will likewise be no difficult matter to shew, that a principle of this kind is utterly inconsistent with farther exhibitions, on this subject, delivered by *Moses*, the sacred historian. For let it only be asked,

1.] IN the first place, how does the rank and character of *Michael*, comport with *the solemn preparations* made by the *Hebrew law-giver* for the present interview? Because we are told, that he did not attempt this ascent, till, *rising-up early in the morning, he had built an altar under the hill, and set-up twelve pillars, according to the twelve tribes of Israel: Sending likewise young men of the children of Israel to offer burnt-offerings and sacrifice peace offerings of oxen unto JEHOVAH*¹. Nor did the solemnity end here. For we are told, that, after this, *Moses took half of the blood, and put it in-*

¹ Exod. xxiv. 4, 5.

to basons, and half of the blood he sprinkled on the altar. And as to the other half of the blood [which was in the basons] he took and sprinkled it on the people¹; and among these, no doubt, on Aaron and Nadab and Abihu and the seventy elders of Israel.

HERE therefore we observe the most solemn rites of sacrifice taking place, as *a needful preparatory*; first, to their becoming *parties* of that covenant, which JEHOVAH was now entering-into with them²: And, secondly, to their being *qualified*, as such parties to ascend the mount with Moses, and injoy the promised interview.—But can we allow ourselves to think, that these sacrifices were offered to *a created angel*? Or, does it seem probable, that they could have had no access to *a mere creature*, without bringing, as we may say, *the blood of bulls* with them in their hands: An honour peculiar to *the presence* of THE ONE GOD? Again,

2.] How does a supposition of this kind correspond with that marvellous circumstance; a circumstance, here mentioned as an instance of distinguishing favour; that *they saw* THE GOD of Israel, and yet *did live* to come down from the mount, and *to eat and drink*? Surely, it must abate much of *the wonder*, on the one part; it must greatly allay *the grace*, here insinuated, on the other; if the person, they had been now seeing, were *a created angel*, and *such only*. Once more,

3.] DOES it not seem clear, that the repre-

¹ Exod. xxiv. 8.

² Ibid.

sentation, with which all of them, excepting *Moses*, were now favour'd, was precisely of the same kind with those, which *Isaiab*, and others of the prophets have been indulged, on particular occasions? And which, I believe, by the general consent of all expositors, are allowed to have been representations, not of *Michael*, but, of THE eternal JEHOVAH himself? Or, does it not exactly correspond with that glorious appearance, which OUR SAVIOUR made at *his transfiguration* on the mount; when *his rayment was white as the light, and his face did shine as the sun* ¹ in his meridian lustre?

WOULD not all these considerations tempt one to be positive, that there was here *something more* to be seen than *a mere creature*, tho' it were *Michael* himself? But, if something more than a creature; certain it is, that it must be either THE eternal JEHOVAH himself, or CHRIST, *the angel* of HIS PRESENCE; CHRIST, *his tabernacle*. For, always residing in him, JEHOVAH gives no displays of himself, especially in *a gracious way*, but in and through *that medium*. And, in whatever he does, or says, CHRIST, HIS SHEKINAH, always bears part: And AS MAN, an inferior nature, and therein *a veil* to THE GODHEAD, gives every *external* view of him; and, therefore, is undoubtedly to be consider'd in that light on the present occasion: By this means, or on this principle, laying just claim to a share in the character before us. For, as he is that person, WHO FOLLOW'D JEHOVAH; so, he is that person, who

¹ Matth. xvii. 2.

is inseparable from him : And therefore takes part in every character with him, even in that of JEHOVAH, ; much more then, in this of THE GOD of *Israel*. But I go on,

VIII. To the next character, which is that of his being THE GOD of *Abraham*.—In this character, likewise, I can grant THE MESSIAH a strict property : Not, however, in the low sense of a *created angel* ; but as a branch of human nature, conversant with this patriarch, as well as the whole *Jewish* church, in *his pre-existent spirit* ; and as being equally THE TABERNACLE of THE GODHEAD at this time, as upon his incarnation : *His connexion* with THE ONE eternal GOD still giving him this interest or claim.

AND that this is the real matter of fact, cannot, I think, but appear to full satisfaction from the observations thrown together under the preceding head. Because, it will be immediately confessed, that that DIVINE person, who was THE GOD of *Israel*, was, likewise, THE GOD of *Abraham*. For, till such time as the SUPREME being was pleased to give forth his character of JEHOVAH, on his raising-up *Moses* to conduct *The Israelites* out of *Egypt* ; the most distinguished names, by which he had revealed himself, were either that of GOD ALMIGHTY, or those of THE GOD of *Abraham*, and THE GOD of *Isaac*, and THE GOD of *Jacob* ¹. So that, if this character belong to THE invisible JEHOVAH, in any one place of

¹ Exod. iii. 6, 15. compared with ch. vi. 3.

scripture ;

scripture ; it likewise belongs to him in all. Here then is the origin of the title. It takes it's rise from, and rests immediately with, the DIVINE being himself. But then as this DIVINE being, agreeable to repeated observations, is no longer A naked, simple DEITY ; but, THAT GOD, *who dwels bodily in CHRIST* : So, in consequence of that inseparable union which there is between them, it likewise devolves to OUR blessed SAVIOUR, pre-existing as above.

AND, that it cannot belong to him, as being archangel *Michael*, or a mere created intelligence ; but as THE ONE GOD is resident in HIM, THE MAN, CHRIST ; will appear by introducing a few of the more interesting circumstances in *Abraham's* life. For, let the inquiry be : WHO had a right to call *Abraham* from his native country, and command him to attend his pleasure for a future settlement in a strange land, unless it were the ALMIGHTY himself ? Nay, who, but himself, could either incline *Abraham* to take this adventurous step, or give him faith in the promises delivered on this occasion ? Let us hear, what the sacred historian sais on this head, both with respect to *the person*, who commands ; and *the terms*, in which his commands are given out : Now JEHOVAH *had said unto Abram, get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land, that I will shew thee. And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great ; and thou shalt be a blessing. And I will bless them,*
that

that bless thee; and curse him, that curseth thee. And in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed *.

Who then can read these words, without trembling at the thoughts of putting them into the mouth of *a created angel*? Who, that enters into their contents, will doubt, that they came from his lips, who is the sovereign disposer of all persons and things, THE SUPREME GOD? Especially, when he remembers, what St. *Stephen* has deliver'd concerning this very event, when he saith: That THE GOD of GLORY appeared unto him, before he dwelt in Charan², *b. e.* before his removal from *Ur of Chaldaea*, or while he was yet in his own native country. Wherefore, as the instructions given to *Abraham*, and the promises made him, by the verses here transcribed; appear suitable to none but the majesty of heaven: So, *the character*, by which St. *Stephen* here speaks of the person appearing to *Abraham*, puts it beyond all doubt, that no other is principally intended. For to whom can those terms, THE GOD of GLORY, possibly belong, in their first reference, unless it be to THE ONE SUPREME DEITY?—Indeed, as to *the manner*, in which THE GOD of GLORY appeared to him, it is not revealed. But as there is no mention either of *dream*, or *vision*, or *angel*; it is not improbable, but that he appeared to him by CHRIST, HIS SHEKI-

* Gen. xii. 1—4.

* Acts vii. 2.

NAH, AS THE MESSENGER of THE COVENANT, OF THE ANGEL of HIS PRESENCE.

So, if we follow *Abraham* in his progress through the land of *Canaan*, we shall still find THE JEHOVAH attending him; and *Abraham* building altars to him and calling upon his name ¹.—Again: What care does THIS JEHOVAH take of him, when driven by famine into *Egypt*? plaguing *Pharaoh* and his household with great plagues, on account of *Sarah* his wife ².—Then, in the conquest of the four kings, and the rescue of *Lot*, his nephew, we see part of the original promise fulfil'd; *Abraham* being herein made an eminent blessing to those, whom he rescued ³.—After these things, saith the text, the word of JEHOVAH came unto *Abram* in a vision, saying: Fear not, *Abram*, I am thy shield, and thy exceeding great reward ⁴. How illy must these words suit the mouth of a creature?—Besides, who could either assure an heir to *Abraham* himself, or *Canaan* for a settlement to his posterity ⁵?—Again: When *Abram* was ninety years old and nine, JEHOVAH appeared unto *Abram* and said: I am THE ALMIGHTY GOD, &c. renewing his covenant with him, and changing his name, as a token of a more ample blessing in reserve for him ⁶.—After this, again, on the institution of *circumcision* (ver. 9th :) Who could

¹ Gen. xii. 6—8.

² Ibid. ver. 17.

³ Ch. xiv.

⁴ Ch. xv. 1.

⁵ Ibid. ver. 4—7.

⁶ Ch. xvii.

¹, 5—8.

have

have a right to this instance of *Abraham's* obedience, but the sovereign of heaven and earth? — And then, as to his entertainment of *the three men*, who are likewise called *angels*; and the conversation, that passed between *JEHOVAH* and *Abraham* in reference to the destruction of *Sodom* and the cities of the plain; has it not been fully shewn, that *THE* true *JEHOVAH* is a party concern'd? — And in this manner such, who are disposed for the inquiry, may trace the remainder of *Abraham's* history; which I am obliged to decline for brevity's sake.

NOTHING then is wanting in respect to the present character, *THE* GOD of *Abraham*, but to remind your lordship of that standing observation: That though *THE* eternal GOD himself be the first and supreme object in all these cases; and, indeed, every where, through the whole of revelation; yet it is not, as he is *AN* absolute, pure *DIVINITY*, but as he has fixt *HIS* *TABERNACLE* in a branch of the human nature. In consequence of which, *CHRIST* is ever to be taken into the account as *HIS* *SHEKINAH*: Who thus becoming the place of his residence, and the medium through which he acts; or, in other words, rising *THE* *MAN* GOD's *FELLOW*, and *THE* *ANGEL* of *HIS* *PRESENCE*; is found to bear *the same names*, and perform *the same works*, with *THE* eternal *JEHOVAH* himself. And therefore while, in it's highest sense, the character belongs to *THE* *ONE* *GOD*; it also, in a relative sense, belongs to

to CHRIST, the MEDIATORIAL person. But I advance by observing,

IX. THAT the next character introduced by your lordship on the present occasion, is, that of his being THE JEHOVAH of *The Jews* ¹.—The texts, on which this character is raised, are two; the former by *Hosea*: *But I will have mercy upon the house of Judah, and will save them by JEHOVAH THEIR GOD* ². What then is there in this? Merely an *Hebrew idiom*; where *the substantive* is put for *the pronoun*. For when God saith, by the prophet, *I will save them by JEHOVAH THEIR GOD*; *The English* is: *I will save them by MYSELF, THEIR GOD*. An over-sight, which, I am well assured, had been culpable in any person, but your lordship.—The other text, is, where the prophet *Zechary* has these words: *I will strengthen them in JEHOVAH, and they shall walk up and down IN HIS NAME, saith JEHOVAH* ³. Here again, my lord, a palpable *Hebraism*, *the substantive* for *the pronoun*, evidently occurs. And therefore, when proper allowance is made for the variation of *the idiom*, the text will read thus: *I will strengthen them IN MYSELF, and they shall walk up and down IN MY NAME* [h. e. IN ME] *saith JEHOVAH*.

So that, when the above texts are put into our own form of speech, it is very plain: That they are so far from insinuating any dis-

¹ *Essay*, §. lxxv.
x. 12.

² *Hof.* i. 7.

³ *Zech.*

inction of persons, that the character, JEHOVAH, whether it stand alone, or whether it be applied to the *Jewish church*; absolutely centers in one and the same intelligent agent, namely, THE invisible JEHOVAH. And therefore the additional complaint against your lordship, in this part of the work, is, that you have introduced a new DIVINE character, without *any distinction of person* to support it.

NEVERTHELESS, if the character [THE JEHOVAH of *The Jews*] must be applied, not to *Michael*, but to CHRIST [though I see not, I own, the left foundation for a *division* of this kind;] the grand principle, on which it is to be accounted-for, as founded *in the structure* of HIS PERSON; is, I presume, that, so often inculcated: Namely, that as certainly, as THE eternal JEHOVAH is here personally concerned; so certainly will it follow, of consequence, that HIS SHEKINAH must also be present to take part with him. The reason is: That these two persons are inseparable *in nature*, as well as *operation*. What I mean is: That JEHOVAH can no more be secluded *his tabernacle*, than *the tabernacle* can be dispossessed of THE DEITY.

X. THE JEHOVAH of *Zion* is another character framed by your lordship on the present occasion, taken, likewise, from *Zechariah*: *Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion: For, lo! I come, and I will dwell in the midst of thee, saith JEHOVAH. And many nations shall be*

joined to JEHOVAH in that day, and shall be my people : And I will dwell in the midst of thee, and thou shalt know, that THE JEHOVAH of hosts hath sent me unto thee ¹. — Upon this your lordship again distinguishes in favour of Michael ; supposing THE JEHOVAH of hosts to be THE eternal, invisible JEHOVAH, and THE JEHOVAH of Zion, the subject of our present inquiry, to be the archangel.

I. THE FIRST thing, therefore, to be settled for acquiring the true sense of this passage, is, a thorough acquaintance with *the person, who here speaks*. — Now, this person, according to your lordship, supported, I find, by Calvin's sentiments on the text ; is, no other than THE MESSIAH ² : Only that THIS MESSIAH, according to *The Essay*, is Michael, the archangel ; and, with Calvin, THE SON of GOD, as a second DIVINE person. However, great as these authorities are, I must beg leave to say, that I cannot but look upon this interpretation, as a matter quite arbitrary. Because, supposing only, that we may be allowed to keep to *the first or literal sense* of the place ; I apprehend, it is very apparent, on the natural run of the words, compared with the office of Zechary : That, in the former part of the account, he is strictly making a declaration for THE invisible JEHOVAH, as though THE invisible JEHOVAH himself was the person here speaking : *Sing and rejoice, O daughter of*

¹ Zech. ii. 10, 11.
in loc.

² Vide Poli Synops.

Zion :

Zion : *For, lo ! I come——saith* JEHOVAH. And that, in the latter part of the account, he is speaking directly of himself in his *prophetic* character [or, at most, of himself in conjunction with *the angel*, who had been sent by God to give him information in these things ;] when he saith : *And thou* [Zion, or the Jewish church] *shalt know, that THE JEHOVAH of hosts hath sent me.* And what inclines me to be of this opinion (keeping to *the letter* of the text) are such considerations as these ; some on the part of THE invisible JEHOVAH, and others on the part of Zechary, the prophet :

I.) FIRST, on the part of THE invisible JEHOVAH, it is to be observ'd,

(1.) THAT it looks like a manifest force on the words, to suppose that the term JEHOVAH, in the beginning of the text, is to be understood of one person, namely, CHRIST ; and THE JEHOVAH of hosts, in the close, of another, namely, THE FATHER : The distinction in the text, I apprehend, lying wholly in that clause of it, where it is said, THE JEHOVAH of hosts [as one person] *hath sent me*, the angel, or prophet [as the other person.] Especially, do I look upon this partition of the terms, THE JEHOVAH [of Zion, as your lordship puts it] and THE JEHOVAH of hosts, in this unnecessary light, as there is nothing to give the least countenance to it, that I can see, but only, that the prophet, in the name of his principal,

addressing the *Jewish* church, under the character of *Zion*, makes use of the single appellation, *JEHOVAH*, in one part of the discourse; and then, afterwards, referring to his own mission from *THE* same *JEHOVAH*, speaks of him by a more complicated title: *I will come unto thee, saith JEHOVAH, &c. and thou shalt know, that THE JEHOVAH of hosts hath sent me.*

NOT but were we to reflect on the liberty, which your lordship here takes of coining *DIVINE* appellations, it might, probably, deserve to be considered: Whether, if *the number of characters*, in matters of this sort, were to be multiplied by *the number of objects addressed*, or by *the number of things*, on which the name of *JEHOVAH* is called; it would not either lead us to an extravagant length, or involve us in a variety of needless distinctions. — Be the consequence, however, in this respect, as it may, certain it is, that there is nothing in the present mode of speech, which does not fully correspond with *Nathan's* dialect in the message he was sent with to *David*: On which occasion, we find him speaking of *THE* same God, sometimes by the name of *JEHOVAH*,

¹ Thus, for instance, we should hear of *THE JEHOVAH of the ark* [1 Chron. xiii. 10.] *THE JEHOVAH of the tabernacle* [Lev. xvii. 4, 5.] *THE JEHOVAH of the temple* [Deut. xii. 5, 6. 1 Kings viii. 43. Jerem. vii. 10, 11. Apply these scriptures to p. 337, six lines from the bottom, where the use of this character, in respect of *the tabernacle* and *temple*, was left doubtful.] *THE JEHOVAH of the pillar of cloud*, &c. [Exod. xvi. 9, 10.] *THE JEHOVAH of Jerusalem* [1 Kings xiv. 21. Dan. ix. 19. — And, indeed, *THE JEHOVAH of every individual person, and of every individual thing*. Upon which the inquiry would be: Where is the propriety of such descriptions?

simply;

simply; and, at other times, by the name of THE JEHOVAH of *hosts*; as has been already observed. So that, I cannot but put the question and ask: Does it not seem clear, on this view of things, that THE JEHOVAH, who here promises *to come to Zion, and dwell in the midst of her*; is the very same person with THAT JEHOVAH, who now inspired *Zechariah*, and sent him to make this declaration in his name?—There seems therefore, in my humble opinion, no sort of propriety in the present distinction of character; nor, indeed, any, the least foundation for it in the text. And this will appear yet more fully, when I come to subjoin,

(2.) ON the part of JEHOVAH: That *the interest*, which the person now speaking avowedly claims in *the nation address'd*, seems a farther proof, that no other person is, primarily, intended by this character, but THE invisible JEHOVAH, THE JEHOVAH of *hosts*. For as all creatures are his, in the first and natural sense of the word; so, likewise, is the church, particularly, by the highest spiritual claim. Wherefore, when the prophet declares in the name of his master: *I will dwell in the midst of thee, saith JEHOVAH, and many nations shall be joined to JEHOVAH in that day, and shall be called MY PEOPLE, &c.* It is manifestly an *Hebrew* form of expression, and is therefore the same as if JEHOVAH had said: *They shall be joined to ME in that day, and be called MY PEOPLE.* By this means making the whole account center

in himself, the one JEHOVAH of hosts. But then,

2.) LET us now farther see, how the matter turns-out with regard to the prophet himself.—Here then, I apprehend, these latter words [THE JEHOVAH of hosts] carry nothing in them, but what is wholly of a piece, with declarations made by other prophets in support of their divine mission. Thus, for example, *Isaiah* asserts his prophetic character by saying: *The Lord JEHOVAH and HIS SPIRIT hath sent me*¹. And the prophet *Ezekiel* appeals to the event, or the accomplishment of his predictions, as an incontestable proof of his being commission'd by ALMIGHTY GOD: *Thou shalt be a sign unto them* [in making no outward shew of mourning on the death of his wife] *and they shall know, that I am JEHOVAH*²: And, consequently, that thou has acted herein as my minister, and by my orders. And, again, chapter xxxiii. 33. *And when this cometh to pass,—then shall they know, that a prophet hath been among them.*

To the same purpose, therefore, is, what *Zechary* here says. For instance: “When
“*The Jews* are returned from *Babylon*, and
“have not only rebuilt their city and the temple; but, in consequence of it, likewise find
“the visible tokens of JEHOVAH’s presence among them, by an affluence of all kinds of
“blessings, temporal and spiritual: Then shall

¹ Ch. xlviii. 16.

² Ch. xxiv. 27.

“ they

“ they be throughly convinced, that both
 “ what *the angel* of JEHOVAH has now disco-
 “ vered to me, and what I have delivered to
 “ them, in consequence of my prophetical
 “ function ; have been matters of DIVINE RE-
 “ VELATION. And therefore that I have, on
 “ no occasion, been speaking to them in my
 “ own name : Neither when I have exhorted
 “ the remaining part of *The Jews* to desert
 “ *Babylon*, nor when I have urged those, who
 “ are now at *Jerusalem*, to procede with vigour
 “ in finishing the work, they have already be-
 “ gun ”.

THIS, I say, seems to me to be the natural and obvious sense of the place : And therefore, that the above distinction of persons (founded on an imaginary difference of character ;) is so far from having any share in the just explication of it ; [keeping, particularly, to its *literal* sense] that THE same invisible JEHOVAH appears intended, as well in the former part, as in the latter part of the text : And that the true reason, why the prophet is allowed to express himself in such manner, as though THE invisible JEHOVAH were really speaking, is only, that, by this means, he might add greater weight to his exhortations on the one part, and to his promises on the other.

HOWEVER, the better to carry-on the argument with your lordship, I consent to give the whole of this up ; and therefore [admitting the partition of character between THE FATHER and CHRIST, here contended for:]

I will suppose, that what might be now affirmed, either of *the angel*, or prophet, or both, in a lower or literal sense; as well in reference to their mission by ALMIGHTY GOD, as the conviction *The Jews* should suffer on the accomplishment of the predictions here delivered: And, again, farther, that what was now true, respecting THE invisible JEHOVAH, *coming* to the *Jewish* church after their return from *Babylon*, and taking-up *his residence* in the second temple, *with the rest*: I will suppose, that the whole of this has a farther reference to, and is to meet it's full completion in, THE PERSON of THE MESSIAH, and the state of Christianity under the new-testament period: Particularly, therefore, that THE MESSIAH here speaks in his own name, and declares not only concerning himself, that *he will come to*, and *dwell amongst* his people, the church; but also, that he does not scruple acknowledging, to the honour of HIS FATHER, that *he was sent by* THE JEHOVAH of *hosts*: I repeat it, let the several particulars above, together with every other event in connexion with them, be granted: For there is no doubt to be made, let the absolute distinction of character lie, where it will; but that the text, in it's last sense, demands the present spiritual reference: Yet, pardon the freedom, I am bold enough to ask: What will the whole, or any part of this make to your lordship's argument? For example: How will it any more appear, when these several concessions are admitted; either, that

CHRIST

CHRIST challenges the present character, THE JEHOVAH of *Zion*, as a mere creature? Or, that he is, in this particular light, the arch angel *Michael*? Nor so only; but, extending the inquiry: How will it follow (as it ought to do on your lordship's reasoning) either, that the presence of *Michael* among *The Jews*, was the extraordinary glory here promised to the second temple. Or, that his having an important commission, for the times present [wherein, for reasons already given, he can only act as servant to THE MEDIATOR; that his having such commission] is the peculiar happiness of the new-testament church; particularly, in it's latter and more distinguish'd period? This, my lord, give me leave to say, would be making a wretched exchange, indeed! To sink the lustre of the present *Christian* church, as well as that under *the law*, to a degree comparatively despicable!

No, let THE JEHOVAH of *Zion* be CHRIST (since your lordship will have it so;) and let THE JEHOVAH of *hosts*, likewise, be THE FATHER, as you are pleased to assert: But then, let me beg, this small addition may be made in their favour; that both THE FATHER and CHRIST, be allowed to form their character on the plan of revelation. On these terms, as I said before, I resign to the distinction; nevertheless, again declaring, that I am far from believing it *literally just*: However, it being allow'd; the plain question that presents itself is: WHO IS THIS CHRIST, THIS JEHOVAH of *Zion*?

Zion? A branch of the human nature, with THE indwelling GODHEAD, THE true JEHOVAH resident in him; as the only proper basis for the application of *the incommunicable name*.— And again: WHO is THIS JEHOVAH *of hosts?* I answer, as above, THE ONE eternal GOD, not as a simple DIVINE essence; but as that person, who has fix'd HIS TABERNACLE in a branch of humanity; as THAT GOD, who dwells BODILY in THE MAN CHRIST.—And, when this is done, it is most certain, the several articles of the text will come out with equal ease and perspicuity; and this, in such different views, as will discover a beautiful rise in the interpretation. Let this, therefore, for order-sake

2. BE our next attempt on the passage before us: *viz.* To acquaint ourselves with its full reference to the state of christianity under the present period. Here then I have to observe, as leading to *the gradation* just mentioned,

1.) FIRST of all, that we see in *the incarnation* of OUR SAVIOUR, such an accomplishment of the text, as is greatly superior to every thing, which took place in the *Jewish* church, after their return from *Babylon*. Because, by this auspicious event, it immediately appeared,

(1.) THAT JEHOVAH, in both senses of the word, was COME to *Zion*, his church. Hence OUR LORD saith, concerning himself: *Lo! I*
COME

COME—to do thy will, O God :—And to assure us, that he was, by no means, *solitary* in this state, he tells us, that *he was not alone*, but that THE FATHER *was with him*¹. Farther informing us, that by virtue of THE FATHER'S *inhabitation*, he was *in heaven*, even while, here, conversant with the church, upon earth². Again, to suppress enlargement,

(2.) OUR SAVIOUR was frequent in declaring to his disciples, and those, who attended his ministry; that *he came not of himself*, but that *he was actually sent by THE FATHER*³, and therefore *came to do his work*⁴. Once more,

(3.) NOW it was, not only that THE JEHOVAH of Zion, h. e. CHRIST, DWELT in the *midst* of the church, visibly and corporally; but that THE JEHOVAH of hosts, or THE FATHER, was also resident with them, in and through, THE incarnate MESSIAH. Hence CHRIST speaks of himself as *the temple* of THE DEITY⁵: And tells *Philip*, chiefly in consequence of THE indwelling GODHEAD, that *he, who had seen HIM* [in a spiritual manner] *had likewise seen THE FATHER*⁶. And to this,

(4.) THAT, as the result of OUR LORD'S incarnation, *that system of religion* was set on

¹ Heb. x. 7. compared with Matth. xi. 3. and a variety of places in *The Gospels*. ² John viii. 16. and xvi. 32.

³ Ibid. iii. 13.

⁴ Ibid. ch. vii. 28.

⁵ Ibid.

ch. iv. 34.

⁶ Ibid. ch. ii. 19, 21.

⁷ Ibid.

ch. xiv. 9.

foot, or, as the prophet *Daniel* speaks, *that kingdom erected, which should never be destroyed*¹; but, on the contrary, prevail to the subversion of every thing anti-christian, and the bringing all nations to the acknowledgement of *the truth, as it is in JESUS*².—Nor is this any thing more, than what we have already seen, in part, accomplish'd, by the triumphs Christianity has made over several of the kingdoms of the earth; wherein they have been apparently JOINED both to THE JEHOVAH of *Zion* and THE JEHOVAH of *hosts*. What then remains, but to observe,

(5.) THAT, wherever this spiritual kingdom has gained an establishment, all real converts, of all kindreds and nations and tongues, have been thoroughly satisfied in OUR SAVIOUR'S divine legation; and therefore readily confess'd, that he, as THE promised MESSIAH, *came forth from, and was sent by, THE FATHER*?—Of this kind is that testimony, which CHRIST himself bore to his apostles, while yet among them; since, alike applicable to all his followers, in all ages: *They have known surely, that I came out from thee* [addressing HIS FATHER] *and they have believed, that thou didst send me*³.

THUS then we see, how the several parts of the text have already received an accomplishment by *the incarnation* of CHRIST. But I stop not here, having to observe,

¹ Dan. ii. 44.
xvii. 8.

² Eph. iv. 21.

³ John

2.) THAT

2.) THAT these truths broke forth with additional lustre on the effusion of THE HOLY GHOST. Because this event is to be consider'd, as a farther display of *the joint presence* of GOD and CHRIST with the church; and therefore as a rise on what attended OUR LORD's incarnation and personal ministry. Hence are those words of CHRIST [as including the whole doctrine of THE COMFORTER;] spoken originally to his apostles, but in them to every true christian convert: *If a man love me, he will keep my words: And MY FATHER will love him, and WE WILL COME unto him, and make OUR ABODE with him*¹.——But I have farther to remark,

3.) THAT the whole of this is still *partial*; and therefore, that the last completion of this prophecy, in reference to THESE TWO JEHOVAHS, is yet to come; being to take place in, what I call, *the spiritual part* of CHRIST's reign; when the whole habitable world shall embrace the Christian faith, and therefore both *Jews and Gentiles*, shall JOIN themselves to JEHOVAH, and become *one sheep-fold* under CHRIST, *the great shepherd and bishop of souls*². In which state of universal peace and spirituality, here called THAT DAY, in the last and highest sense of the word; MESSIAH, and therefore GOD in HIM, will be seen, in a yet-more eminent manner, both TO COME to, and TO DWELL in the *midst* of the church. In con-

¹ John xiv. 23.
² 1 Pet. ii. 25.

² John v. 16. compared with

sequence of which, *all tongues*, in general, *shall confess to CHRIST, THE JEHOVAH of Zion*; and to *THE FATHER, THE JEHOVAH of hosts*.

BUT, if the contents of this passage, in it's full accomplishment, turn on these glorious events; the question, that offers for resolution, is, this: *How*, or *in what manner*, will either *THE ONE*, or *THE OTHER JEHOVAH*, effect these great things? For instance, as to *THE FATHER*: Will he either make *this visit* to, or take-up *this abode* with, the church, as *AN absolute God*? No: But as *GOD in CHRIST*. And as *THAT GOD*, who has the first claim to the character of *THE JEHOVAH of Zion*; as being supreme head in the church: Therefore, assuming to himself, likewise, among other reasons, the character of *THE JEHOVAH of hosts*; because *the armies of his saints*¹ are part of that universal dominion, in which that character is founded.

AND then as to *CHRIST, THE JEHOVAH of Zion*, in your lordship's application of the word; will he give accomplishment to these things, as the archangel, *Michael*? By no means: But as a branch of our own, *the middle nature*; as *THAT MAN*, whom *GOD* has made *HIS KING in Zion*.—Again: Will he effect these promises, as *a mere creature, a bare man*? No: But as *THE FULNESS OF THE GOD-HEAD dwells in him BODILY*.—So that, when things are viewed on the *MEDIATORIAL* plan,

¹ Exod. vii. 4. 1 Sam. xvii. 45. Rev. xix. 14.

it is clear to a demonstration, that though OUR SAVIOUR appear to have good interest in the present character, and the events connected with it; yet that angels and archangels, and therefore *Michael*, among the rest; are for ever excluded from bearing any part in the glorious amount of this passage.

XI. THE ESSAY farther describes this person, meaning the archangel by those words: "*I brought thee out of the land of Egypt*"': A character in frequent use with *Moses*, as well to inforce the laws he gave forth, as to insinuate the obligations the people were under to a chearful obedience.

Now, before we can truly inform ourselves in the extent of this character, and acquire such lights, as may warrant us in giving OUR SAVIOUR a part in it; we are to understand, that the present description by no means terminates in the bare act here refer'd to; that is to say, the direct leading *The Israelites* forth out of *Egypt*; but, together with *their exit*, includes the several glorious events, which were *preparatory*; and therefore, in point of time, *previous* to it. We are then, by this state of things, to trace their deliverance up to it's first spring: Namely THE ALMIGHTY'S compassion towards them on observing their aggravated misery; attended with, what we call, a recollection of his promise, made to their fore-fathers on this subject. From hence

we are led forward to his appearance to *Moses*, while a sojourner in *Midian*; and the instructions he gave him to revisit his brethren, *The distressed Israelites*: Succeeded by the obduracy of *Pharaoh's* heart, and the various miracles, that God wrought by *Moses* in the land of *Egypt*: Together with every other circumstance, whether on the part of *Israel*, or on that of *The Egyptians*, conducive to their actual departure and exit. — But, is it possible for us, to enter accurately into these amazing events; adding to them the future history of this people to their settlement in the land of *Canaan*; and, at the same time, take with us a view of the explications given on this subject in the book of *Psalms*¹; and not be convinc'd as well, that *Michael* must needs be inferior to this work, on the one hand; as that, on the other, it bespeaks nothing less than the presence and power of the ALMIGHTY himself?

I MIGHT, indeed, pursue the evidence in this case, by repeating a demand already made on your lordship: Namely, that, supposing facts were not as now represented, you would condescend to direct us to the particular time, occasion and place, where, and on which, THE invisible JEHOVAH [present with them, by your own confession on certain occurrences;] *did ever wholly desert*, either *Moses*, or *The Israelites*: It being evident that, in their worst circumstances, even when *the tabernacle* was

¹ Ps. xcix. 6, &c. cv. 23, &c. cxxxv. and cxxxvi. et alibi.

removed far off from the camp; *Moses* still knew where to apply to *JEHOVAH*, and did even then converse with him in a familiar manner, as *a man* does with *his friend* ¹.

I MIGHT also, in farther support of the present argument, refer your lordship, to what *THE JEHOVAH of hosts* said to *Nathan* on this occasion; where he makes himself PERSONALLY concern'd, in all the affairs of the *Jewish* nation, from first to last.

BUT to avoid unnecessary enlargement, give me leave to bring the matter to a short issue by inquiring as follows: Where is there the shadow of a reason to suppose, that when *Moses* applied for assistance in that critical situation, on their flight from *Egypt*; when they found themselves block'd-up by the sea before them, *Pharaoh* at their heels, and the mountains on each side: Where, I say, is there the colour of a reason to suppose, that *Michael*, and not *THE* true God, was the person, whom *Moses* solicited for the necessary, immediate relief? Who would not tremble for the honour of *THE* invisible *JEHOVAH*, to be told, that *Michael* was *THAT* GOD, who said to *Moses* in this extremity: *Wherefore criest thou unto me? Speak unto the children of Israel, that they go forward* ². Was it *Michael* then, that divided the *Red-sea*, and led the hosts of *Israel* through, as on dry land? Was it he, that triumph'd over *Pharaoh* and his horsemen, by bringing again the waters of the

¹ Exod. xxxiii. 7, &c.

² Ibid. ch. xiv. 15.

sea upon them? And was it to him, that *Moses* address'd that noble song of thanksgiving, in which he celebrates this overthrow with all the force of divine poetry? Was it *Michael*, who led them by *a pillar of cloud*, and by *a pillar of fire*?, in that memorable night; and, afterwards, from one encampment to another, till they gained *the promised inheritance*? — Let facts only be allowed to speak for themselves, and, I imagine, the application will be perfectly easy.

BUT, it will be said, probably, that what has been now suggested, is intirely beside the purpose; or, that it is resolving the whole subject, now under consideration, into *the presence* of THE JEHOVAH of hosts. — It is granted: And why is this done? Because, I own, I am yet ignorant of any other principle, by which we may introduce OUR SAVIOUR, as bearing part in this work. But give the first place to THE invisible JEHOVAH, JESUS, THE MEDIATOR, comes in of consequence. Because (according to the old maxim) where THE ONE GOD is, there also is THE ONE MEDIATOR. For CHRIST, both as SON and as MEDIATOR, claims intirely under THE FATHER; shares no honour, but what is founded in him, and results from his connexion with him. Yet so, as that *the union* between their persons, and *their fellowship* in action, is for ever inseparable. Nor does OUR SAVIOUR explain this matter in

¹ Exod. xv. 19.

² Ibid. ch. xiv. 19, 20.

any other way. And where is the necessity to suppose he should? Since, by this connexion, they are ONE *in presence*, and ONE in operation. — Is it feared, a confusion of *their* distinct personalities must ensue upon this? Not in the least. Because, where the text speaks directly of THE JEHOVAH *of hosts*; WHO is that JEHOVAH of hosts, but GOD in CHRIST? And, when it speaks more directly of THE SON, or ONE MEDIATOR; whose are those characters, but a branch of the human nature with THE FULNESS OF THE GODHEAD *dwelling in him* BODILY? Therefore personally distinct, but perpetually united.

XII. THE ONE character, which yet remains to be considered, is that, by which your lordship represents *Michael* as giving forth the law at mount *Sinai*; and therefore saying, agreeable to the purport of the first commandment: "*Thou shalt have none other gods before me*"¹.

Now, to settle this point in such manner, as to make it correspond with what I proposed in my entrance on this part of the subject; the two subsequent articles are to be attended: Namely,

1. It will be proper to shew, that *Michael* can, by no means, be the object of the present command; the person, giving forth this injunction in reference to himself. And,

2. To examine in what sense, the words may be applied to OUR blessed SAVIOUR; and

¹ *Essay*, §. lxvi.

be supposed to have been delivered by him, as a person directly interested in this awful charge. Wherefore, as to

I. THE FIRST of these heads, the following considerations, I imagine, will fully demonstrate, that the archangel can have no personal interest in the present branch of moral obedience:

I.) BECAUSE to suppose *Michael* here present, as the person delivering these words, and delivering them with strict reference to himself; is not only to suppose THE ALMIGHTY, THE invisible JEHOVAH, to have at this time resign'd his charge of *The Jews*, or withdrawn his personal residence from among them; (which, as has been already observ'd, once and again, is a matter yet to be proved;) but it is also to make your lordship not quite so consistent with yourself, when this principle is examined, in a comparative view, with your declarations on some other occasions, where the presence of THE invisible JEHOVAH is actually admitted. To instance barely, in that one case (because we can here be sure of the fact) where you allow, it was THE invisible JEHOVAH, *who proclaimed the name of the delegated Jehovah*; as your lordship speaks. For, to suppose THE invisible JEHOVAH present on this occasion, and actually concerned in a work of this kind, where the satisfaction of a particular person was only concerned; and yet to contend for *his absence*, or, which is in effect the same thing, *his total surrender of prerogative*, in giving forth the law at mount Sinai,

a mat-

a matter of general import to the whole human species ; is an argument, that seems to want an air of probability to recommend it. For, what is the proportion in these two cases ? Or, when may we expect the presence of the supreme legislator, if it be not, when he is settling the standard of his creatures obedience ?

AND, indeed, so necessary is this principle of his attendance on the present occasion, that were we to suppose, *the terms*, under consideration, issued forth immediately from CHRIST, as a branch of human nature, by his ministers, the angels ; having thereby fully secured right notions of the true MEDIATORIAL person, in his absolute remove from DEITY ; yet, even in this state of the question, would there not be the left room to suppose it, either reasonable, or possible, that THE JEHOVAH of *hosts* should be, absolutely, a stranger at the time of the present solemnity. So far from it, that, on the present supposition, I mean, the attendance of THE true MEDIATOR, the presence of ALMIGHTY GOD would likewise be involved. Where then is there room to plead, either reason, or propriety, for *disuniting* THE FATHER and SON, on the present occasion ? Nor so only : But for taking the important work now in question, out of both their hands, and giving it intirely up to a created angel, according to *The Essay* ? Again,

2.) LET it be consider'd, how this account of the DIVINE legislator corresponds with that

exceedingly pompous and terrible apparatus, which was set on foot, for the delivery of the moral law on mount *Sinai*. For here, if ever, not only *the nature of the thing*, as has been observed already [that is, the delivering a body of laws to *The Israelites*, and, in them, to the whole human species; not only the nature of the thing] but, likewise, *the manner of exhibition*, conspire to assure us: That if the descent, or personal attendance, of THE invisible JEHOVAH was ever necessary and ever indulg'd [together with HIS SHEKINAH] it must certainly have been on the present occasion; as the most effectual means to give weight and solemnity to these moral injunctions. And, I cannot but think, your lordship is the first writer, who ever undertook to dispute this fact. For, can it be reasonably supposed, that all those orders would have been given, about fencing-off the mount¹, and keeping the people at an awful distance? Would there have been any occasion for that dreadful machinery of blackness and darkness, of thunder and lightning, &c? Or, should we have heard, not only of a general terror seizing the people; but also that *Moses* himself did *exceedingly fear and quake*²? Had a process, I say, of this surprising nature been now introduc'd, were there nothing but a created angel, with others, his fellow-angels, to attend? Were *Michael* only to give forth these laws, and not THE ALMIGHTY himself, personally present in CHRIST,

¹ Exod. xix. 12.
with Heb. xii. 18—21.

² Ibid. ch. xx. 18, 19. compared

HIS TABERNACLE? The reason of things, I imagine, must needs give it against your lordship. Not but to strengthen this side of the question, it is observable,

3.) THAT your lordship, by putting these words into the mouth of the archangel, is reduced to this extraordinary confession: "There-
" by *seeming* to forbid even the Worship of
" the supreme *Jehovah*, the *Jehovah* of hosts".
—Is not then a principle, that *actually seems* to involve so manifest a contradiction, a sufficient alarm to the pious, intelligent christian? Should not I immediately discard that doctrine, which had a *tendency*, though it were no more, to infringe on the inalienable rights and prerogatives of THE one, supreme GOD? Not to observe, that there is a something more, than what *only seemeth to be thus*, in the present case. Because it is absolutely so. The words are peremptory and personal: And therefore, by no means, make any provision for your lordship's distinction of worship into supreme and subordinate. So that the real consequence of this doctrine, is, that it absolutely breaks in on your own principles; actually destroys all subordination between THE invisible JEHOVAH and the archangel, *Michael*: Reason sufficient, why he cannot be the person intended; the object of the present command.

To what a shameful issue are we then brought by your lordship's doctrine? Since, when the inspired historian recommends the observance of every DIVINE injunction, moral

¹ *Essay*, as above.

and ceremonial, by that solemn form of words: I AM JEHOVAH [THE LORD:] it is no more THE invisible JEHOVAH, but *Michael*, the archangel, who speaks! *Michael* then, must not only be the person, who enjoins the various sacrifices under the law; but be, likewise, the person, to whom they were offer'd. In short, *Michael* must be ALL in the whole circle of all religion, *Christian*, as well as *Levitical*.——But to mention these things, is, in my humble opinion, to refute them. The thread here is too fine spun, to support the weight, it was design'd to carry.

Thus then, I would hope, I stand fully discharged from the business of my first head; which was to demonstrate, that *Michael* can have no share in the present command, as a branch of his own personal character. I proceed therefore,

2. To the other division of this subject; by which I have undertaken to inquire into the principles, on which an attribution of this kind may be justly made to OUR SAVIOUR. And here the explication may be found to turn on the several following particulars:

1.) CHRIST is, undoubtedly, THE ONE MEDIATOR between GOD and men; and, as such, was *from everlasting* charg'd with all the concerns of the church, so as to be even head of it and king in it, under THE FATHER, his glorious constituent. Let OUR SAVIOUR then, rise to view in this light, in the matter before us, and we shall soon see, how well these words

words become the lips of him, who is THE LORD *from heaven*; THE UNIVERSAL LORD over all persons and things: *Thou shalt have no other gods before me.* As though CHRIST had said: "I am appointed supreme head over all worlds by THE FATHER, during the extent of the MEDIATORIAL kingdom. It is to me, as the next, *immediate* object, that THE FATHER hath directed the homage of all his intelligent creatures to be paid, for the whole of this period; Having, in consideration of my submitting voluntarily to the arduous work of redemption, *in a measure*, renounced his own, first, absolutely supreme claim, for the present; on purpose to do me, as THE ONE MEDIATOR, the more peculiar honour in the face of angels and men". But then farther,

2.) If we would yet more fully acquaint ourselves with the grand principle, on which OUR SAVIOUR may be suppos'd to declare himself as above; and, by virtue of which, he chiefly lays claim to the obedience here injoin'd; it must, I imagine, be resolv'd supremely, or in the highest sense of the word, into THE DIVINE INHABITATION; meaning, that one fundamental doctrine of holy scripture, which informs us: That ALL THE FULLNESS of THE GODHEAD *dwells* BODILY in THE MAN, CHRIST. A principle, which evidently carries-up his claim to obedience of all kinds from the bare consideration of *the autho-*

rity,
1 Cor. xv. 47.

city, he is invested with as MEDIATOR, according to the preceding head: I say, carries it up from hence to his PERSONAL interest in the DIVINE nature, by virtue of that intimate and inseparable union, which subsists between HIM and THE ONE GOD: OUR SAVIOUR being no longer what he is, in his person, duly consider'd; then while we take into his private structure, or metaphysical nature, a view of THE indwelling DEITY. So that for greater distinction-sake, I might add, to what has been now suggested,

3.) THAT to pay CHRIST due reverence, in the real issue of things, is to worship DEITY ITSELF: What I intend, is: That the homage, which is paid to CHRIST, when truly genuine, is homage founded in, and resulting from, THAT SUPREME DIVINITY, which, besides dwelling in CHRIST for the purposes of it's own glory; is likewise to be considered as a necessary ingredient to the constitution of CHRIST's metaphysical nature; and is, therefore, always to be regarded as the supreme dignity of his person.

NOR can we, in the left, enter into this state of the present subject, but we shall immediately inform ourselves in the true reason, why so many, in this day, commence advocates for THE SON'S being intitled to *subordinate worship* only. Because, not considering the necessity of the DIVINE inhabitation to the metaphysical structure of CHRIST's person, they look upon him as a mere creature, absolutely detached from

from THE DIVINE BEING, like ourselves ; and therefore conclude, that he is to be treated entirely in that way ; that is, as *the first mere creature* [at the same time forgetting, how impossible it is, that a being of this kind should exist, without supposing, that *a proper medium*, for the DIVINE being to operate through, has been *previously* produced¹.] Whereas, when we come to know, that there is *such a connexion* between the DIVINE and MEDIATORIAL persons, as to give THE SON a claim [though not to the title of *another god*, yet] to a share in THAT DIVINITY, which is truly SUPREME ; we are naturally led to infer, that he cannot, likewise, but have interest in *that worship*, which is the glorious peculiar of SUCH DIVINITY.

NOR is this much different from a principle advanced by your lordship at the close of the xxviiith, and the begining of the xxixth *sections* ; where you intimate (if I may be allowed to put it in my own words:) “ That THE “ ALMIGHTY may lay what honour he “ pleases on any of his productions in a consistency with his own perfections.” — Such a being then is OUR SAVIOUR. A constitution, that cannot but share with him in his nature and attributes (by *the DIVINE inhabitation* ;) and yet, that neither does, nor can, infringe on his supremacy and independency : Because avowedly *his production*.

¹ See above, *marginal note*, p. 299, &c.

BUT

BUT the full discussion of this point belongs to another place: [Namely, the head of *worship* due to CHRIST, as a matter connected with HIS DIVINITY; should an opportunity for considering it present.] Only thus much I would beg leave to observe for the current service: That though it must be owned, that the more common and stated order of religious worship, as prescribed in THE BIBLE, is, "To address THE FATHER by THE SON"; in consequence of which it appears, that CHRIST is more strictly cognizable *as the medium* of such worship: Yet this, it should, likewise, be remembered, is equally notorious: Namely, that the above order is so far from being perpetually observ'd in holy scripture, that we have from thence, not only just ground to infer, that THE SON, though MEDIATOR [and even, according to *the first* of these three heads¹, because he is MEDIATOR] has an indisputable right to be join'd with THE FATHER in acts of this kind; but we have it also in our power to turn to a variety of places, where he is absolutely so join'd; and this both in acts of *prayer*², and likewise those of *thanksgiving*³. Nay, which is more: We have some examples, where he is prayed to *alone*⁴; and others, where his name [as he is the repository of all grace, and the next,

¹ See above, p. 440.

² 2 Thess. i. 2. and ch. ii. 16, 17.

³ Rev. i. 5, 6. and ch. v. 13.

⁴ Luke xxiii. 42. Acts

vii. 59.

immediate object of worship] is even *set before* that of THE FATHER in the same petition ¹.

AND for *the grounds* of this procedure, if that be YET an inquiry, I confess that, superior to all other reasons, the first and principal with me, is, what has been here, once and again, suggested: Namely, that where THE DEITY IS ONE [for THE GODHEAD, that stands collected in CHRIST, is absolutely SUPREME;] there, I apprehend, carrying things to their just height, *the same obedience or worship* must, of necessity, take place.—At least, does this, thro' the condescending appointments of THE FATHER, seem to be *the allowed case* for the present, that is to say, during the MEDIATORIAL dispensation of things. [Not but, when it is considered, that there will be always, to a never-ending eternity, *the same necessity* for THE invisible JEHOVAH's retaining the humanity of CHRIST as *his tabernacle or veil*; that there was for his assuming it at the first, or, as the scriptures speak, *from everlasting*: Namely, that he might gain such a situation, as might render him capable, in a consistency with the infinite perfections of his nature; I might say, first, of forming; and then, of communicating with, the several orders of his creatures: When this is duly considered, I cannot but apprehend, there is good reason to conclude, agreeable to a former hint of this kind ², that THE SON's *subjection* to THE FATHER *in the end*, to use the apostle's words; is such a change, as

¹ 2 Thess. ii. 16, 17. and 2 Cor. xiii. 14.
above, p. 373.

² See

is design'd to affect his present government or administration only; and, therefore, will not, in the least, infringe, either on his metaphysical structure, or personal dignity.]

THERE is, doubtless, a great depth in these matters; from whence holy scripture takes occasion to speak *of the mystery of God*, even THE FATHER, and of CHRIST, THE ONE MEDIATOR: *The mystery* here, I conceive, being this: How CHRIST, who, in his absolute remove from DEITY, is, purely, a branch of *the human nature*; should, nevertheless, be taken into that intimate connexion with THE GODHEAD, as not only to have full interest in *the same characters and titles*; but also to have a PERSONAL right to share *the same worship*, with THE ONE, invisible JEHOVAH.——Whether we may be ever able, fully, to enter into these things for the life present, or not; this, however, I think, we may depend upon: That A pure absolute DEITY, is NO DEITY at all: What I mean is, there is NO SUCH DEITY to be found, on the MEDIATORIAL plan: That still directing us, first of all, to GOD in CHRIST; and then, back again, to CHRIST in GOD. But, if they are thus mutually connected [though distinct] in their persons; it is no wonder, that they stand represented, as giving forth, respectively, *the same laws*, and sharing, jointly, *the same obedience* from their creatures.

¹ Col. ii. 2.

AND

AND thus, both in consequence of your lordship's *version* of that text in *Exodus* [WHAT FOLLOWED HIM] and in deference to your representations, concerning *Michael*, at large; I have taken a particular view of *the several characters* exhibited above, and have examin'd with what accuracy I could, how far, or in what light, they may be supposed applicable to CHRIST, THE true MEDIATOR: Having observ'd, that his first and chief claim is to be always drawn from that strict connexion, which did *from everlasting*, and which will *to everlasting*, subsist between the DIVINE and MEDIATORIAL persons. The consequence of which is, that as he cannot but partake with THE FATHER *in his nature*, by virtue of the DIVINE inhabitation: So, he must, for the same reason, partake with him *in his several appellations*.

BUT, though the present representation be, undoubtedly fact; I am, nevertheless, to prevent mistakes, here, again, obliged to observe (because it has been already hinted at, more than once, in the explication of the *characters* themselves;) that though there is, doubtless, a good sense, in which all of them may admit of accommodation to THE MAN, CHRIST, both as SON and as MEDIATOR: Yet, that this sense is *only relative* and *secondary*; as well because CHRIST, as THE SON of GOD, is *a derivation* from THE FATHER in respect of his person; as also, because he is strictly *the constitution* of THE FATHER in regard to his office: And there-

therefore that such of these characters as are more eminent have their first reference to, and their highest completion in, the person of THE invifible JEHOVAH himself, as the source of *all being and power*.—And fo strictly true is this principle, and of fuch general application in thefe matters: That even in thofe texts, where we meet with characters *more directly appropriate* to CHRIST; or, where he is represented, either as *the immediate or fole agent*; no folid and full interpretation, I apprehend, is to be come-at, unlefs we fuppofe, at the fame time, that the DIVINE being, or FATHER, is perfonally refident in CHRIST, and ever operative with him.

As to many of the above characters, indeed, were it neceffary to procede in giving full evidence of the fhare that ALMIGHTY GOD has in them; it would be no difficult matter to fhew from the facred records, that, what your lordfhip calls THE GOD of *Israel* (applying that term wholly to *Michael*) is by thofe records made the character of that being, who is otherwife called THE JEHOVAH of *hofs*¹. And fo on, through the feveral other characters:

¹ SEE 2 Sam. vii. 8. compared with verfes, 10, 11. And again, with verfes, 23, 24. particularly, verfes, 26, 27. THE LORD of *hofs* is THE GOD of *Israel*. For thou, O LORD of *hofs*, GOD of *Israel*. See alfo Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the temple, 1 Kings viii. 22, &c. And this, doubtlefs, is Zacharias's ufe of the word, Luke i. 68. Because we fhould otherwife confound THE GOD of *Israel*, in this verfe, with what is called *his horn of falvation*, meaning CHRIST, in the next verfe.

Such as THE JEHOVAH of *Zion*¹; THE JEHOVAH of *The Jews*² (though both these appear to be characters of your lordship's own framing;) THE GOD of *Bethel*³, of *Abraham*⁴, and the rest. For the real matter of fact, in the *scriptural* state of this affair, is: That all these characters, in general, are made the express and original property of THE ONE supreme GOD; descending therefore from him to OUR SAVIOUR, by virtue of that connexion, which obtains between the DIVINE and MEDIATORIAL persons. But I decline a farther explication on this head, for brevity-sake: And therefore content myself with refering, by *the margin*, to a collation of such texts of scripture, as may illustrate *the affinity*, or, rather, *the sameness* of person, with regard to those characters, which are most considerable.

WHAT next offers to consideration, is, from *section lxvi*; where we are obliged to your lordship, for raising a very material objection to the principle, on which you had just before

¹ SEE the explication above on *Zech. ii. 10, 11. p. 417, &c.* See also *Pf. xcix. 1* and *2* verses compared. And *Pf. cxxxii. 11, 13.* compar'd with *2 Sam. vii. 26, 27.*

² WHO is THE JEHOVAH of *The Jews*, but THE JEHOVAH of *Zion*, and to whom belong those characters, except to THE GOD of *Israel*? And that THE GOD of *Israel* and THE JEHOVAH of *hosts*, are one and the same person, see the scriptures above: Not but I might here subjoin *1 Sam. i. 17* and *11.* compared. And *ch. xv. 1, 2.* and *xvii. 45.* And *2 Kings xix. 15;* &c. — Besides, it is self-evident, that the same DIVINE being, who was THE GOD of *Israel*, or THE GOD of *The Jews* (after the Dispersion of the ten tribes) as a *civil establishment*, was likewise THEIR GOD in a *religious capacity*.

³ & SEE the explication of these characters, above, *p. 256* and *411, &c.*

reason'd, concerning *the mission* of CHRIST, as THE JEHOVAH of Zion: A matter of such consequence in the present dispute, as must not only prove fatal to your own *hypothesis*; but, at the same time, fully justify the plan of interpretation advanc'd in these sheets.

THE OBJECTION, or, as your lordship terms it, "The only Difficulty in this Case is this, " that the *Jehovah* of Zion, though in this " one Place he acknowledgeth himself to be " sent by the *Jehovah of Hosts*" [referring to those characters, consider'd above, from *Zechariah*;] " yet in other Places this *Jehovah* " of Zion, or the Angel which appear'd unto " *Abraham*, and *Jacob*, and *Moses*, does not " always declare that he is deputed, and speaks " by the delegated Authority of the *Jehovah* " of Hosts; which is the general Meaning of " the Phrase of speaking *in the Name* of any " one; but actually and literally speaks in " his own Name, and calls himself *Jehovah*, " and saith, *I am the God of Abraham*; and *I* " *am the God of Bethel*; and *I brought thee* " *out of the Land of Egypt*, &c. and positive- " ly prohibits *Moses* and the Children of *Is-* " *rael* from worshiping any other God but " himself: *Thou*, says he, *shall have none other* " *Gods before me*. Thereby seeming to forbid " even the Worship of the Supreme *Jehovah*, " the *Jehovah of Hosts*".

WHO, the real person intended by these characters, is, we have seen above; having explained in what senses they may be said to be-
long

long to CHRIST, whether we consider him as God's *tabernacle*, or *his prime external agent* : And also, in what other senses they appear to be applicable to THE invisible JEHOVAH, and to include severally, his real, operative presence. But as the explication of these characters here given, and that exhibited by your lordship, is widely different ; my present business is to examine the subject in your lordship's sense of it : Namely, as pointing us to the archangel, *Michael*.——And here I cannot help saying, that, as an application of this kind appears to me without any parallel ; so, I hope to give full proof to others, that it is likewise without all foundation. Nor need we go far for it ; this proof rising naturally from the three following heads. First, the persons here to be opposed. Secondly, the characters assumed. And, thirdly, the declarations made. Wherefore as to

I. THE FIRST of these. Who would ever once attempt to reconcile such distant parties as *Michael* and CHRIST ; meaning, CHRIST in connexion with THE indwelling DEITY ? Or, otherwise, such distant parties as *Michael* and THE FATHER, THE invisible JEHOVAH ? Is not then the disproportion in these articles the greatest, that can possibly take place ? Is not the distance between these persons absolutely infinite ? Who then cannot immediately see the impropriety of that conjunction ; the impossibility of that union, where THE ALMIGHTY

and *a mere creature* are set on a level? Add to this,

II. THAT the characters themselves, as given us by your lordship in the above account, directly oppose your system. For, as it is easy to prove (and, I imagine, has been already proved in the course of this address;) that these several characters are truly, and in the first place, applicable to the DIVINE majesty himself: So, is it from thence undeniably clear, that they are, and cannot but be founded in those perfections, which strictly belong to that DIVINE majesty. Now those perfections being avowedly infinite, it is impossible, in the nature of the thing, that they can either be justly applicable to, or truly affirmed of, any one mere creature. We find them, however, certainly applied in two different ways, or to two different persons, meaning GOD and CHRIST. And wherefore? Undoubtedly, to the DIVINE being; because he is infinite perfection itself. And then also to THE MAN, CHRIST; because he is that branch of the human nature, in which ALL THE FULNESS OF THE GODHEAD dwells BODILY. The consequence of which is: That though he be not ANOTHER GOD, personally distinct from THE FATHER; yet, as he is that person, in whom THE ONE supreme GOD stands collected; CHRIST will always involve that INFINITE presence, which must be allowed a proper basis for all DIVINE characters.—Here therefore,

fore, both *the mere creature*, and *an high delegation of power*, are equally insignificant. Because the true subject is still wanting : Namely, that precise structure of person, which can alone result from THE DIVINE INHABITATION. And then,

III. THIS will, again, be found to be the case, if we look into those extraordinary declarations, which THE JEHOVAH of Zion makes on this occasion by your lordship's acknowledgment : The number of which might be easily increased, with great advantage, from the sacred oracle. The demands then here are : Whence *this allowed variation of dialect* ? On what basis does it stand ? What propriety does it plead ; where, on your lordship's own state of the question, the parties concern'd are so distant as GOD and *a creature* ? How comes it about, that one who is really SENT ; for that is the case with OUR LORD as THE MESSIAH ; should, nevertheless, speak of himself as *an absolutely free, voluntary agent* ? How is it, for instance, that he assumes to himself an air of sovereignty in all those affairs, which are directed either to the government, or redemption of mankind ? Saying therefore, that *he came as an act of mere grace* ¹ ; that *he gave himself* ² ; that not THE FATHER alone *worketh*, but that *he worketh also* ³. Nay more : How comes it about, that he not only takes

¹ Heb. x. 7, 9. compared with 2 Cor. viii. 9.
v. 2. Tit. ii. 14.

³ John v. 17.

² Eph.

upon

upon himself *the same characters and titles*, with those appertaining to THE FATHER, here called by your lordship THE JEHOVAH of hosts; but that he likewise challengeth *the same honours*, evident by *actual ascriptions* of that kind? I repeat it: Whence results this singular liberty on the part of CHRIST? And this amazing indulgence on the part of JEHOVAH? — Your lordship offers at a reason or two for settling this point: *Viz.*

I. THE INNACURACY of the *Hebrew* style¹. An observation, however, which comes with the less grace from your lordship, as you seem to think the *Hebrew* writers, explicit and accurate enough, when they have any thing, that makes for your own side of the question. Not but we have seen, that the *Jewish* commentators had a very different subject in view by their MEMRA and *Michael*, from what your lordship would have us believe. So *inaccurate*, however, were they, according to your lordship, that they “left great room for the Imagination of the Reader to supply, and fill “up the Deficiencies”. And yet, I presume, that the persons themselves, whose language it was, and for whose use THE *Hebrew* BIBLE was originally written; were perfectly well acquainted with the sense of *Moses*, and their several prophets. What therefore appears dark to us, and requires *frequent supplements* to reduce it to the *English* standard; I

¹ *Essay*, §. lxvii.

² *Ibid.*

doubt

doubt not, was exceeding plain to *The Hebrews* themselves: Which, therefore, cannot but enervate this part of your lordship's intended solution.

BESIDES, it should be observed, that this is so far from being peculiar to the *Hebrew* tongue; that it is found more or less attendant on all languages, when we come to translate them. For which reason that, which is common to all languages, is not to be made a peculiar objection to the *Hebrew* only. This notwithstanding, each person, I suppose, of an ordinary capacity, may be presumed to understand his own dialect, be it ever so *laconic*; though, if it were to be put into another tongue, for the use of foreigners, it might not be found equally clear without such *additional* insertions.

AND farther, with respect to the liberty your lordship is here pleased to take with the books of the old testament in the original; I make no doubt but that, you are thoroughly acquainted with *Ainsworth's* version of *The Pentateuch*, &c. This you are sensible is, as near as possible, a verbal translation of the *Hebrew* text: Which, though it has but *few supplements*, is yet very intelligible to the *English* reader; and would, I presume, have been still so, had there been *even fewer* of them. So that the multitude of *supplements* in OUR BIBLE, cannot be supposed absolutely wanting to ascertain the sense of the sacred text; as tho' it were impossible to understand the mind of

the inspired pen-men without such additions ; but rather to accommodate the translation to our own idiom, or, as we commonly say, to make it *Better English*. Wherefore, when the whole of this is put together, as it must be apparent, that little, or no, benefit, could arise to your lordship from the present objection ; it is really difficult to conceive, what could be your lordship's temptation to make it ; unless it were to abet *Deism*, and therefore, to pull that down with one hand, which you profess to be building-up with the other. But then,

II. YOUR LORDSHIP has another method of accounting for the liberty taken, above, in those speeches, which you refer to *This secondary Jehovah* : Namely, " That it was customary for one Person to speak in the Name " and Character of another Person, without " making the least Mention of the other Person, in whose Name the Words were " spoken ". Nay, your lordship proceeds so far as to assert: That " nothing is more " common than for Prophets and Angels to " speak authoritatively in their own Name, " without introducing their Speech with an " explanatory Preface, mentioning the Person " in whose Name they speak ".

Now, before I come to examine the particular instances, which your lordship has been pleased to select in support of this assertion ; suffer me the following general remark : Namely,

¹ *Essay*, §. lxvii.

² *Ibid*. §. lxix.

THAT if this *introductory* preface be not always made use of in the delivery of every different prophecy (for we shall find several put together in one chapter;) yet it is certain, that this was their ordinary method. But, whether it were perpetually after this sort, or not; if we consider, that they might be called to deliver several prophecies (where they are short) in the same day; or, which is yet more to the purpose, that they were sufficiently known in all these messages to be the prophets of JEHOVAH: Does it not tell us, that there could be no necessity for their introducing every prophecy with these *formal* prefaces; but that by their general, public character, and by the nature of what they had in commission to deliver; the people were thoroughly apprized whose the words were, and in whose name the prophet spake; that is to say, in God's, and not their own?

AND then, as to their delivering these prophecies *in the first person*, saying, *I will do this, or the other*: Is it not well known, to be a standing rule in reference to all messengers, especially those of the sacred class: That they are to deliver themselves *in the very words*, which JEHOVAH had put into their mouths? I appeal to your lordship, not only to say, whether this was not the usage of the antients, where *an herald* was sent to deliver a message from a general, or prince; but also, whether it be not accounted an elegance, and, indeed, a

Essay, §. lxx.

rule,

rule, not to be dispensed with? In all which cases, however, there was never the least danger of confounding the sovereign with his herald, nor the prophet with his God.

BUT, to acquaint ourselves more fully with the merits of your lordship's present argument; let us see, what those instances are, which you have adduced to prove, that THE JEHOVAH of Zion [by which you mean *Michael*] may be supposed to speak of himself by the name of the eternal I AM; or in the style of THE most high GOD; and assume to himself *all the works, and prerogatives* of THAT GOD, though he stand at the distance of a mere creature in the *metaphysical* structure of his person, and has nothing to plead, but the possession of a certain quantity of *delegated power*: — [A power, I must again observe, incompatible

¹ *Essay*, §. lxxii. It might not be amiss to inquire here: How the applying this character I THAT AM [which, by the way, is as much superior to the title of THE JEHOVAH of hosts, judged by *The Essay* and some others, to be the sole prerogative of THE FATHER; as it is certain, that the glory of *self-existence*, included in the present character, is, and cannot but be, in the nature of the thing, greatly superior to *all mere government whatever*; which is, nevertheless, the extent of that other character, THE JEHOVAH of hosts: I say, it might not be amiss to inquire in this place: How the applying this appellation, I THAT AM] to *Michael*, confessedly a creature, and no more; corresponds with accounts at *section ii*; where *The Essay* makes this a character of the one SELF-EXISTENT being. And that it must be his sole property, or expressly include his presence, wherever it is used; is demonstrable from the reasoning afterwards advanced in *section xxviii*. Because there can no more be two self-existent BEINGS, than there can be two all-powerfuls, or two supremes.

with

with the private nature of every such mere creature.]

I. AND the first instance, which your lordship exhibits in support of this doctrine, is founded on accounts in *The second Psalm*, concerning which you observe: That " it is allowed by the universal Consent of all Antiquity, as well *Jews* as *Christians*, that, in the second Psalm, *David* is there speaking of the *Messiah*, and yet the whole Psalm is delivered in the Person and Character of *David* himself". After which you proceed to transcribe several verses of *The Psalm*; but insist, particularly on those words at the 7th verse: *I will declare the decree: JEHOVAH hath said unto me, Thou art MY SON, this day have I begotten thee* ¹.

Now fully to invalidate the whole proof, which your lordship has promised yourself from *This Psalm*, permit me,

I. IN the first place, to ask: Is your lordship insensible, that *This second Psalm*, together with the greater part of *The other Psalms*, has a double reference? the one literal, in which the subject is *David*; the other figurative, in which the subject is *CHRIST*? What then can have induced your lordship to drop the above literal reference of *This Psalm*? You cannot but know, that it is an established rule with expositors: That the literal sense of the text, where it will apparently admit of such

¹ *Essay*, §. lxxvii.

² *Ibid.*

sense,

sense, is always the first thing to be attended. What account then is to be given for this omission? Is it, that this peculiarity had, at no rate, suited your lordship's purpose? Very true. For, when this literal reference is taken into the explication, as the primary sense of *The Psalm*; behold! *the speaker* is one and the same from the beginning to the end of it. It is *David*, who speaks; and that, in his own person; when he says: *I will declare the decree*, meaning, in respect to himself, *that decree*, by which THE ALMIGHTY had constituted him the king of *Israel*, notwithstanding the outrage of the several neighbouring states. Where then is there, *this variation of person*, your lordship would insinuate? Where is it, that *David* takes upon him to assume the character, or speak in the name of THE true MESSIAH? Since, as was just now said, the subject is one, and the person one; *David* speaking of himself, and therefore using, with the last justness, the personal pronoun, I: *I will declare the decree*, &c. Add to this

2. It being then clear by accounts now given, that there is a literal interpretation belonging to *This Psalm*, let *that* have it's place; let that literal interpretation stand first. However, not to stop here, since *This Psalm*, by [almost] universal consent, has also a farther meaning, a spiritual, or figurative, sense; let *that* likewise be admitted. But then, with submission, let *The Psalm* have justice done it on this side, as well as on the other: What I intend

intend is: Let it not be represented as literal in one part of it, and as figurative in another part of it: By no means. But, if a fair, consistent interpretation be aimed-at; let it be acknowledged, that *The Psalm* is all of a piece: As much one, in it's spiritual application; as it is one, in it's literal. What then is the consequence? Certainly, that as *David* had been, confessedly, the speaker throughout, in the literal sense of *The Psalm*; so let CHRIST [in his turn] become equally the intire speaker throughout, in the spiritual explication of *The Psalm*. And to CHRIST, in this sense, it undoubtedly belongs, as fully and properly, as it does to *David* in the other sense; both in what concerns OUR LORD before his crucifixion, as also in what relates to his kingdom upon his resurrection. — And thus it is, that Bishop *Patrick* has given us a very consistent and beautiful interpretation of *This Psalm*, in both these directions. — But if matters really stand thus, the question returns: What is the variation of character? Where is the change of person? For, is it not clear, that CHRIST here speaks as truly in his own person, in the spiritual reference of *The Psalm*; as it is clear, that *David* speaks in his own person, when it comes to be explain'd in it's literal reference?

3. AND thus, again, would the decree [which your lordship thinks so remarkable a circumstance in your favour, because promulged by *Nathan*, and not by JEHOVAH (should that turn out a just and satisfactory state of the case)

case) thus, I say, would *this* present *decree*] likewise be found capable of accommodation to both these subjects, with equal ease and propriety.—For, as to *Nathan*, personally, his character being publicly known; let the terms, in which he deliver'd himself, have been what they will; the people, of necessity, would be so far from mistaking them for an *authoritative declaration* of his own, that they would, from an acquaintance with his character only, be immediately assured, that they were no other than the words of *THAT GOD*, in whose name and person he appear'd. —And then, as to *the thing* deliver'd, I mean, *the decree* or *promise*, here mention'd: If it admit of a literal reference to the subject, on the part of *David*; it must likewise admit of a spiritual reference, on the part of *THE MESSIAH*. But I hasten to that, which is most extraordinary in this case. For we shall find,

4. *THAT* your lordship does not scruple saying: That “ though *this decree* was delivered unto *David*, yet the Purport thereof “ was not promised to *David*, but to some “ one of the seed of *David*”. And therefore that *the decree* here mention'd, is the same, with what God delivered by *Nathan*, 2 Sam. vii. 12, 14, 16. Where God saith of *this seed*: *I will be HIS FATHER, and he shall be MY SON* '. On this I would observe as follows:

Essay, §. lxviii.

1.) FIRST,

1.) FIRST, That as *David*, by the general consent of expositors, appears to be the person, literally intended, in *This Psalm*; and therefore in this particular branch of it among the rest: So, it refers to him, as raised from a low, afflicted condition to sit on the throne of *Israel*, mangre the enmity of numerous, surrounding princes. Wherefore, when kept in it's proper channel, if *David* here, in the letter, refer to *any verbal decree*, delivered to him, by some certain prophet, it must be: That he had now *no other decree* in view, than that, which was delivered to him from the mouth of *Samuel*; by whom, it is certain, that THE ALMIGHTY promised him the throne of his master *Saul*. But as *David* himself was an inspired prophet, highly honoured by JEHOVAH himself; I am rather inclined to suppose, that *the decree* in this place, may intend some peculiar intimation of the DIVINE council, in regard to his *regal* dignity, made to him, immediately, by THE SPIRIT of GOD; or, however, something of this kind, in conjunction with, or super-added to, *the promise* he had received by the ministry of *Samuel*. Nevertheless.

2.) FOR argument-sake, I procede with your lordship's account of this matter.— And with regard to *that promise*, you are pleased to quote, as above, from the second book of *Samuel*; I imagine, every one, who reads the context with any attention, will instantly

stantly find, that the person there intended, is *Solomon*, from this one circumstance: Namely, that God saith of *This Seed*: *He shall build an house to my name*: The words, therefore, being apparently a *promise* made to *David*, concerning his immediate successor; and not to *David* himself, *personally*; as the case, I am inclined to think, is, in *The second Psalm*.

Nor but it must be observed, that your lordship is so very cautious in this particular (as though you perceived, there were consequences likely to arise from your being too open, that might not be so much to your purpose;) that you have taken care to leave yourself sufficient room for evasion. Because, instead of asserting, directly, that the person is *Solomon*; you have only said, that *the promise* was "to some one of the Seed of *David*": Thus leaving the argument intirely at large. But, whether your lordship choose to be explicit, or not, on this subject; it is very plain, not only from the circumstances, mentioned above; but also from the whole context, that *Solomon* must be the person [literally] refer'd to by *Nathan*. As well because there was none of the seed of *David* employed in building the temple, but *Solomon*; as likewise, because the very design of *Nathan's* attending *David*, at this time, was, to give him information on this subject: Therefore telling him, in the first place, that his design of engaging in this work himself, was perfectly acceptable

to

to THE ALMIGHTY; but that for certain reasons (then, it should seem, not disclosed to the prophet) he did not choose to employ him so directly in it; but would reserve the honour of this work to one of his Sons. Wherefore, as Solomon did build the temple, he, of course, must be *That* particular *Seed* here refer'd to¹.

WERE

¹ I AM sensible, that Mr. *Pierce* [paraphrase on *Heb. i. 5.*] therein following Mr. *Whiston*, will have *this prophecy* in *Samuel*, refer solely to THE MESSIAH: And therefore insists upon it, that it is intirely a different prophecy from that in the 1 *Chron. xxii. 7—10*; and puts together, chiefly from Mr. *Whiston*, many labour'd arguments to support this Opinion. But though I can readily allow, that, among the arguments there urged, some of them may bid fair enough to prove a *spiritual reference* really intended by the prophecy in *Samuel*; yet I think, I may be pretty positive, not only that others of them may be readily set aside [the principal matters being *supposed*, rather than *proved*; as arguments 2, 3 and 5;] but also, that an equal, if not a greater number of arguments, and those, I imagine, more clear and forcible, may be produc'd, why *this first prophecy* (as these gentlemen distinguish it) must contain a *literal sense*. Nor can I persuade myself, but that it must certainly appear to any, who will carefully inspect those prophecies, that the great subject throughout, in *the letter* of the text, is one and the same: Namely, what relates to the building a *material temple* at *Jerusalem*.

HENCE, therefore, it is, with reference, more especially to that prophecy in *Samuel*; that the account opens with *David's* intention to erect such an edifice; followed by *Nathan's* approbation of this design, when first communicated to him by *David*. After this, we hear of the prophet's waiting upon *David* with a *prohibition*, as full and positive as can be, by the manner, in which THE ALMIGHTY argues the case with *David*; verses 5—7. [the contrary to which is *suppos'd*, without any foundation, by arg. 3.] And who cannot see, that these several particulars, in any other than a *literal* view of the subject, must have been quite impertinent? After these things, the prophet gives him a promise from *JEHOVAH*, that he would continue *the regal authority* in his family for several generations successively: And likewise acquaints him with God's resolution to raise up from among his sons, a *particular person*, who should erect that temple,

WERE it then to be allowed, that *Solomon* is the person here intended : What would your lordship gain by the concession ? Nothing, that

which *David*, though ambitious of building himself, was now commanded not to attempt. Nor must we forget to observe, that the whole is elucidated and confirmed by the *prayer* and *thanksgiving*, which *David* made upon this occasion. In which acts of devotion, such circumstances appear to occur, as put it beyond doubt with me, that *David* understood this prophecy, at least in part, in a *literal sense*.

BESIDES, it deserves to be consider'd, How it is possible to imagine any thing so extraordinary, as that *David* should have nothing in view, but the erecting a *material temple* (a design too, countenanc'd at first, and after that, countermanded by *Nathan*;) and yet, that the *grand*, nay, according to these gentlemen, the *intire drift* of this prophecy, should turn on so very different a subject, as that of *CHRIST*'s raising a *spiritual temple* only. I own, I am here greatly at a loss to find the coherence. Again,

IF a *material temple* was no part of this prophecy, wherefore did *David* immediately decline the work ? If no *temporal kingdom* was in view, what means that *contrast*, here evidently set on foot, between *JEHOVAH*'s conduct towards *The Seed of David* now spoken of; and his conduct towards *Saul*, the first king of *Israel* ? For here the difference plainly is : That though God had taken the kingdom absolutely out of the hands of *Saul* for his disobedience ; he here, on the contrary, promises, that he will not procede to this extremity with *That Son of David*, who was to sit on his father's throne, and erect *this material temple* : But only that, if he should transgress, as, we know, *Solomon* did ; he would then correct him and his wicked subjects in a gentle, fatherly manner, without transferring the kingdom into another family.

I AM therefore, so far from thinking, that the prophecy in *The Chronicles*, is a different prophecy from this in *Samuel* [I mean, as to the grand subject-matter of it ;] that I look upon it, to be no more than a *repetition* of that original prophecy by *Nathan*, with a *supplement* of some particulars privately revealed to *David* ; though not directly at the same time, yet very soon after : THE ALMIGHTY's tenderness to his favorite prophet and king, being such, that he would not leave him, for a length of time, to struggle with any uneasy conjectures, as to the true reason of his taking the work out of his hands : That same tenderness likewise engaging THE ALMIGHTY not to make an im-

mediate

that would answer your purpose. You would only contradict the sense of all expositors, *Jews* and *Christians*; and set *The Psalm* at variance with

mediate discovery of those reasons to *Nathan*; but to deliver them, soon after, in a more secret way to *David* himself. And I am the rather confirm'd in this opinion, because the reason, on which *David* was prohibited from building the temple, occurs in no other part of this history, but that, which is given by *David* himself in *The Chronicles*. And, it cannot but appear with great propriety, in this place: As well to secure *David's* honour with his son, in the charge he was now giving him; as to encourage *Solomon* himself in undertaking this great work.

THIS, likewise, it should be observed, directly suggests to us a plain and good reason, why the same number of articles, are not to be expected in both these places. Because, as it must be confessed, that revelation, in all it's parts, is the prerogative of God himself; so, it is natural enough to suppose, that the body or substance of this prophecy was originally deliver'd to *David* by *Nathan*; but that it pleased God to enlarge it, afterwards, to *David* himself, as he saw it most seasonable and necessary. And there is likewise this reason to be given for his having it thus by immediate inspiration, as we know that *David* himself was frequently honour'd with the prophetic impulse: In which case *David* might very properly say, That *the word of THE LORD came to him*, or that God himself *spoke to him* on this occasion. Not, I apprehend, but there would be sufficient ground for *David's* expressing himself in that manner, even on supposition that this prophecy was brought to him, with enlargements, by any one of God's prophets, his cotemporaries.

It will then be ask'd: What is to be done in the case? Nothing more, than what other expositors, particularly bishop *Patrick*, has done already: *viz.* That we be contented to apply the several particulars in these different scriptures to *Solomon*, so far as they may be found to hold good of *Solomon*; and, where they contain any thing too exalted to admit of such accommodation, that we then refer them to THE MESSIAH: allowing only, that though these several things receive a lower completion in the type; yet that they are, in the last and highest reference to be applied to CHRIST, the great antitype.

NOR can I see, why either of the above gentlemen should be averse to this double interpretation. Since it, at no rate, that I can apprehend, either infringes on the merit of divine revelation in general [it being easy with God, to whom all his

with the history of *Solomon*. And, when all this was done, it would still be found, that as *Solomon*, in his *regal* character, was as much a type of CHRIST, as *David*, his father; so, that the same double reference (in that part of it, at left;) and consequently, the same double explication of *The Psalm*, would here likewise take place: The one, refering to *Solomon*, in the letter; and the other to CHRIST, in the figurative purport of *The Psalm*.

AND then, though *Solomon*, indeed, could not be introduced, as the person delivering those words: *I will declare the decree*; but *David* only; the real matter of fact, in this case, would be: That we should not, in the left, want his presence. Because, the only consequence upon this would be, that as *the promise* was made to *David* by *Nathan* for his son [cen-

works, in their various dependencies, were ever perfectly known, to make natural things figurative of spiritual;] nor on the truth of St. *Paul's* inspiration, respecting the epistle to *The Hebrews*, in particular. For, as I am well assured, that, unless we admit this double interpretation of scripture, in many places, in the book of *Psalms*; and, again, in others, by the prophets of the old testament; we must of necessity destroy the whole beauty of those several passages: So, St. *Paul*, surely, without any impeachment of his character as an inspired writer, might be allowed that application of the present prophecy, which THE HOLY GHOST always design'd by giving it forth to *Nathan*; which was, that those words, THOU ART MY SON, &c. have only their full completion in the person of THE MESSIAH — Having had an opportunity of consulting a treatise, intitled, *An Historical Account of the life and reign of David*, &c. since the above hints were put together; I have the pleasure of observing, that the ingenious and learned author, makes no scruple of giving this prophecy by *Nathan* a literal reference to *Solomon*, and his raising a material temple at *Jerusalem*; as, at left, part, if not the whole, of it's original contents. See Vol. II. Ch. I.

tering,

tering, therefore, either in the whole, or in part, in *Solomon*;] it is certain, that *David* was the person, who could properly take upon him to deliver *This Psalm*, and particularly the *promisory* part of it, as it here stands. For, on this view of things, he, and he only, could say: *I will declare the decree: JEHOVAH hath said unto me [concerning a descendant of mine] THOU ART MY SON, this day have I begotten thee*: Because, it must be acknowledg'd, a verbal assurance made to *David* himself, in favour of *Solomon*. So that, even taken in this light, *David* still appears to speak for himself, and not for another.

3.) NOT, as was hinted above, that I would have your lordship suppose, that this application of *The Psalm*, or this particular branch of it, to *Solomon*, will be admitted. Very far from it.—I have gone this length only to give your lordship's argument it's utmost scope, and to shew, at the same time, that it contains nothing capable of supporting, what it was produced for; supposing it to have been, at all, produced with this view.—And to give full proof, that what I have now advanc'd, is the real matter of fact, let it only be consider'd, that the general state of *Solomon's* kingdom, or reign, is a flat contradiction to the contents of *The whole Psalm*; and therefore cannot but stand as an irrefragable reason against its being applied in that manner. Because he not only ascended the throne in peace, after his father, *David*, had subdued all the

neighbouring princes, his enemies ; but held it also in peace, till his idolatries, in the decline of life, were the cause of God's raising-up different enemies against him. In which particular too, it must likewise be observed, that this part of his history (as was suggested above) is at variance with accounts at the 8th and 9th verses of *The Psalm*; which promise an increase of conquests and an extent of empire ; whether you refer the subject to *David* or CHRIST : Because, the longer *David* reigned, the farther he carried the limits of his kingdom, in a literal sense ; and the longer CHRIST shall reign, the more will he, likewise, extend his spiritual dominion : Whereas, in reference to *Solomon*, as it is notorious, that he came to the throne in peace ; so, is it likewise, that he was less prosperous towards the close of his reign.

BUT, what if it should, at last, be said, that by those words, " some one of the seed of "*David*", your lordship actually means no other person than CHRIST himself ? If so, the only thing the reader has to complain-of, is, that your lordship, after the example of the late Mr. *Pierce*, has not been open enough to tell us it in words at length.—For Mr. *Pierce* supposing, as your lordship does, that those words at the 7th verse, THOU art MY SON, *this day have I begotten thee*, are taken from the above passage, 2 Sam. vii. 14. *I will be HIS FATHER*, and he shall be MY SON ; refers both places to THE MESSIAH, and

and to him only ; agreeable to which, he proposes this one thing for the better understanding *This second Psalm* : Namely, That “ the whole of it should be consider’d as uttered in the person of the Messiah, and that whatever are the words of God the Father to him, they are here related by the Messiah as his, h. e. the Father’s. This way of expounding the Psalm, sais he, avoids the frequent change of the speaker, which must otherwise of necessity be allowed. Nor can I perceive the least difficulty in keeping to this rule through the whole Psalm ”.

Now, if it be so, that your lordship has been induc’d from hence to refer the contents of *This Psalm*, and particularly *this decree*, to the same person with this author, meaning to THE MESSIAH ; the question natural upon it is: Why did not your lordship also retain this author’s manner of explication ? You refer, it seems, this part of *The Psalm*, at least, to CHRIST ; but you do not care to admit him as the direct speaker in it. No, this had prevented your lordship’s objection. This had made the exposition too plain. There had then been no change of person, for your lordship to have played out, and to have obscured the text with.—But Mr. *Pierce* observes, that, in this natural turn, all the ancient *Jewish* commentators are against you ; and that, as to *The modern Jews*, they are, as usual, at variance among themselves in their application of *This Psalm* ; merely because they are afraid

of giving *Christians* an handle of applying it to *JESUS of Nazareth*, as THE true MESSIAH.

HERE being then, from the accounts now given, sufficient ground to conclude, that the contents of *The Psalm*, in their spiritual reference, at least, are to be applied to CHRIST; there is also, for that reason, sufficient ground to conclude against your lordship, that he is the person, who here speaks, and not *David*: That is, taking *The Psalm* in it's spiritual reference: And, consequently, that there is not that change of person, your lordship would introduce¹. But to procede with *section lxxix*, which gives us,

II. THE

¹ NOTWITHSTANDING I cannot but think, that Mr. *Pierce*, in his notes as quoted above, has clearly proved, that *This Psalm* has an undoubted reference to CHRIST; yet in agreement with many other expositors, and particularly the commentaries of the late bishop *Patrick*; I am obliged to enter an objection to his exclusion of *David* from having any part in *This Psalm*, and his restraining the contents of it to THE MESSIAH only. For,

I OWN, I am in the same way of thinking in regard to *This second Psalm*, that I was in above, in reference to those texts in *Samuel* and *Chronicles*: What I mean is: That this likewise has it's double reference: Having therefore a view to *David*, in the letter of *The Psalm*; and a view to CHRIST, in it's spiritual import. Nor can I bring myself to think, that what that learned author has objected to this application, has weight enough in it, to set it's reference to *David* intirely aside.

FOR, though we hear of no particular time of *David's asking*, that is, *praying*, for the conquest of his enemies and the extent of his dominion (which I may call one of that author's objections;) yet we may readily assure ourselves, that so pious a prince, as *David*, was not backward to put-up a request of this kind, among his other petitions; though we are not acquainted with any precise time of his preferring this address in a singular degree. The book of *Psalms*, however, is, in the general, a witness, that he pray'd for nothing more ardently and frequently, than the confusion of his enemies: The principal reason for which

was

II. THE NEXT instance, produced by your lordship for proving that "the Prophets speak authoritatively in their own Name,——" with-

was, that he considered them as the enemies of CHRIST, and his church at large.

AND though it was not literally true, that his kingdom extended to the ends of the earth; nor that the heathen were particularly commanded to trust in David; nor, again, that they are any where expressly said, to be blest in David (which are other objections;) yet, I suppose, none of us expect to find the same degree of eminence and truth in the type, that we may reasonably expect in the substance itself. It is therefore, I apprehend, sufficient in the present case, with regard to David, that there be a shadow of those things; such a resemblance, which, though faint, cannot, however, but excite in us an idea of correspondence between the type and antitype. And thus it certainly was in respect to David and his kingdom. Because, as he himself was a figure of CHRIST; so, was his kingdom, likewise, typical of CHRIST's kingdom, both in it's nature and extent. Wherefore the enemies, that David conquered, are always consider'd, in scripture, as the enemies of the church in common; so that, in conquering them, there was, as in miniature, a prefiguration of the intire conquest of all the enemies of the church by CHRIST himself.

AND, as it was, certainly, no mean privilege to be a subject of David's kingdom, or to be incorporated into the Jewish church and polity (in which line all nations were to be blessed :) So, was that relation a figure of, and to The true Israelite, a present part in, those substantial and durable blessings, which all injoy, who are real subjects of CHRIST's spiritual kingdom. And in this view of things also, David might, in a sense, be an object of trust: As he was GOD's king and a type of CHRIST; and as his government was a kingdom of GOD's peculiar setting up: that, in which he himself eminently presided, and for the prosperity of which GOD himself was especially concerned. Those, therefore, who could view David and his kingdom in this light, could never want encouragement to become subjects of the Jewish kingdom, and put themselves under David's protection, as standing, in some sort, in the room of GOD, to all his people. For the real fact is, that it is in itself a blessing to have a religious prince to fly to, and trust in. And the character of such

“ without mentioning the Person in whose name they speak”: And, therefore, as a natural consequence, that *Michael* may, likewise, be allowed, or supposed, to speak absolutely in his own name, though a mere creature, under the sanction of a certain delegated power from GOD, THE JEHOVAH of hosts. What then is this second instance? Scriptures mightily detach’d, indeed. For your lordship joins the first verse of the second chapter, to the first verse of the third chapter of *Isaiab*. And what for? I profess, I see not, unless it be to assure us, that, when *Isaiab* opened his credentials, as it were; he lets the children of *Israel* know: That he came not to them in his own name, but in the name of ALMIGHTY GOD. See the verses: *The word that Isaiab, the son of Amoz, saw concerning Judah and Je-*

such a prince has the force of a command, whether a verbal one be exhibited, or not.

AND then, lastly, when it is ask’d: “ How is it true of *David*, that he broke them [the heathen] with a rod of iron, &c.” I make no doubt, but he might, not merely as the effect of state-resentment, but even, in some measure, by divine influence, treat *The Ammonites* with the several severities we read of on his conquering that people, as a figure of that future destruction, which shall overtake all the enemies of the *Christian* church, in the last day: Answering therefore to the accounts in *This Psalm*, and acquitting *David* of inhumanity on these occasions: It being certain, that, together with the other devoted nations, the children of *Ammon* stand on record as an eminent type of those enemies of the church, who are yet reserved for exemplary punishment under the effusion of the seventh vial. There seems therefore, in my humble opinion, room enough to admit both *David* and CHRIST their respective share in *This Psalm*; supposing only, that it’s last and highest accomplishment is to take place in the person and character of THE MESSIAH.

rusalem.

rusalem. [Ch. ii. 1,]—*For, behold, the Lord,*
 THE JEHOVAH OF HOSTS *doth take away from*
Jerusalem, and from Judah, the stay and the
*staff, &c.*¹ Thus far then the matter cannot
 but be plain enough: Thus far THE JEHOVAH
of hosts is certainly in view.—“And then”,
 saith your lordship, “some verses afterwards
 [which, by the way, is no farther off than the
 4th verse, and what I have now transcrib’d is
 the first; “some verses afterwards] he saith,
 “*And I will give children to be their princes,*
 “*and babes shall rule over them, &c.*”. Could
 then, any of *The Jews*, who were in their
 senses, mistake *Isaiah* so far as to imagine, that
 he deliver’d these words in his own person;
 especially, as they were all deliver’d at one
 and the same time, and make, together, but
 one and the same prophecy? Let it be ask’d:
 What character did *Isaiah* now bear? For whom
 did he now act? or, in whose name was he sent
 to this people? Was he not publicly known to
 be the prophet of JEHOVAH? Was he not
 known, in the exhibition of this prophecy, to
 come from THE JEHOVAH *of hosts*? In whose
 name then could he be supposed to speak, un-
 less it were in the name of his principal, *this*
 JEHOVAH *of hosts*? Nay more: Did he not in-
 troduce this prophecy by a solemn declaration,
 delivered *in due form*, that *the words* were not
 his own, but those of JEHOVAH, even THE JE-
 HOVAH *of hosts*? What are the 2d and 3d ver-
 ses, but a continuation of *the words of this JE-*

¹ Ch. iii.

HOVAH of hosts, as given out to *Isaiah* for the body of *The Jews*? Wherefore, going on with his embassy, and observing *the very terms*, in which the prophecy was deliver'd to him by JEHOVAH himself, that it might effectually impress *The Jews*; he saith, not in his own name, but in the name of his master; now too personating his master: *I will give children to be their princes, and babes shall rule over them.* What closer connexion do we want? What stronger indication, that *the words* are JEHOVAH's, and not *Isaiah's*? — Not but it might likewise be a farther question: With what colour of reason can it be expected [or what was the necessity] that in the compass of four verses, three of them very short, *Isaiah* should interrupt the thread of his prophecy by a repeated, explanatory preface: *Thus saith THE LORD*? Or, indeed, it might be rather ask'd, as the *Hebrew* style has been already excepted-to: Had such an insertion been made, would not the very persons, who are now willing to misapply the text, have been the first to have complain'd, either of a *tautology*, or an *impropriety* in the speech?

BUT your lordship, I imagine, makes *Isaiah's* apology, for delivering himself in this manner, very justly, by saying: That though he intended those words [*I will give children, &c.*] should be understood of himself, and not of JEHOVAH; yet, “ he knew very well, *The Jews* would, of themselves, supply the deficiency ”. — Now, as there is *no de-*

fiency in this text, supposing the prophet design'd the words should be understood of himself; because he absolutely speaks in the first person: *the true deficiency* in this place (were the matter allowed) must certainly be charged to the prophet's not repeating the title of his master in the delivery of these words. But this repetition your lordship's observes, was quite needless; because "*The Jews* would, of themselves, supply such deficiency".—— The amount then of your lordship's observation in this case, if I may put it into other words, seems to be this: Namely, that the prophet was sensible *The Jews* could not be capable of such a palpable blunder, as what they must, of necessity, incur, by taking his words in the sense put upon them by your lordship. They would instantly know, by his very character and office, or, at least, by *his introductory preface* in the beginning of the chapter, that he could not be speaking in his own name, but in the name of JEHOVAH. So that the real fact, in the present case, is, neither more nor less than this: *viz.* That, properly speaking, there was not *the least deficiency* in the prophet, nor so much as a possibility of *misapprehension* in *The Jews*.

Not but this also, by the way, again proves, that your lordship's preceding objection to *the inaccuracy* of the *Hebrew* tongue, comes just to nothing at all. Because *The Jews*, we find, by your present concession, were so well acquainted with their own modes of speech,

as

as to be in no danger of mistaking their prophets, or sacred historians; though the one might not, at the begining of every period, insert, *Thus saith* JEHOVAH; and though the other, for brevity-sake, might, now and then, take the liberty of using an *ellyphical* expression.—I come now to *section lxx*, which, together with some of the following *sections*, will lead

III. To the third and last instance of this kind. And here, according to your lordship, we are to find *an angel* assuming the same *authoritative* diction with that, which you have, above, supposed used by *the prophets*; concluding, again, from hence in favour of *Michael*, as your JEHOVAH of *Zion*; that he, likewise, may justly challenge the same liberty. This then, we know, is your lordship's usual manner of assertion. I doubt not, however, but the matter itself will be found abundantly clear in the texts quoted on this occasion, and it is by them alone, that the point in question is to be determin'd. Wherefore

LET the contents of *section lxx*. be first look'd into. “ In like Manner, saies your lordship, in the Revelation of St. *John*, though the Apostle declares, that it was delivered to him by an Angel, and calls it *The Revelation of* JESUS CHRIST, *which* GOD gave unto him, to shew unto his Servants Things which must shortly come to pass; and he sent and signified it by his ANGEL unto his Servant
“ John :

“ John : Yet, continues your lordship, thro’
 “ the whole Book this Angel speaks indiffe-
 “ rently in the first Person, either when he
 “ speaks in the Name of God the Father, or
 “ in the Name of *Jesus Christ*, or in his own
 “ Name”.

THE PROOF then is the one thing to be at-
 tended. To this your lordship proceeds by
 adding : “ Thus Rev. i. 10. St. *John* says, I
 “ *was in the Spirit on the Lord’s-Day, and*
 “ *heard behind me a great Voice, as of a trum-*
 “ *pet, saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the*
 “ *First and the Last, &c.* Now this Voice,
 “ *sais your lordship, was UNDOUBTEDLY the*
 “ *Voice of the Angel, &c.*”—But, with
 submission, wherefore UNDOUBTEDLY ? Not
 the shadow of a reason does your lordship of-
 fer in support of this assertion : Nor, indeed,
 will there be found the least, either in this
 chapter, or through the whole book, when
 matters come to be examined, as their impor-
 tance requires.

FOR, notwithstanding it should be allowed,
 that the voice itself, or the words, which St.
John heard from behind him, were actually
 form’d by the ministry or power of this angel ;
 instead of its giving us just reason to infer, that
 they were utter’d by him *in his own name* ; it
 will be found that the consequence is intirely
 the reverse,

1. BY considering only *the common principle*,
 on which all persons, appearing on the stage,
 must be supposed to act ; which, certainly, is
 not

not in their own private capacity, but wholly in the capacity of those they represent. Thus, therefore, though the angel should be allowed to form those sounds, which had the effect of words on the ears of St. *John*; it would, by no means, follow from thence, that he spoke in his own name; but rather, on the contrary, in the name of CHRIST, the person, whom he would, in this case, be now representing. In agreement with which, the words themselves must be consider'd, not as his own words, but the words of CHRIST, the person he here spoke for.

IF this reasoning be not conclusive, we shall strangely confound the different characters in this book. Because, if it be not allowed, that the angel here spoke in the name of CHRIST; neither will it be allowed, that he spoke in the name of any other character through the whole prophecy. Whereas the several speeches made through the piece, and heard by St. *John*, were as truly form'd by the angel, as this now under consideration. Wherefore, if he here speak himself, in his own person, and not in the person of CHRIST; he must, for the same reason, be supposed to speak for *the four and twenty elders*, the representatives of the Jewish church; and likewise for *the four living creatures*¹, the symbols of the Christian church². He must, again, be supposed to speak for *the souls of the martyr*, whom St. *John* saw under the altar³: For *the papal dragon and the false*

¹ Τὰ τέσσαρα ζῶα,
ch. vi. 9, 10,

² Rev. v. 8, 9, &c.

³ Ibid.

prophet¹; for *mystery* Babylon, *the whore*²; and so on. But, as a supposition of this kind would destroy the several characters here introduced, and throw the whole prophecy into the last confusion; it appears a strong reason, why he cannot be suppos'd to speak in his own name, when forming words for CHRIST; any more than in those cases, where he forms articulate sounds for other characters. Wherefore

2. THE much more natural, and, consequently, the much more probable, state of the case appears to be this: Namely, that though he rais'd *the various scenes* in this *dramatic* prophecy, and so modulated the air as to form distinct articulate sounds; yet that the speeches themselves come directly from the several persons, who are here exhibited *in emblem*, or *picture*, to St. John. So that when any one character speaks, he speaks for himself, and speaks in his own name: The words, though form'd by the angel, come directed from the persons respectively represented *by their proper symbols*. Wherefore, if a voice come from THE THRONE, it must necessarily be supposed to convey *the words of* ALMIGHTY GOD³. If it come from THE LAMB, they must, a-

¹ Rev. xiii. 6, 14.

² Ibid. ch. xviii. 7.

³ Just as in giving forth THE LAW at Sinai: It was *the word* spoken by angels, Heb. ii. 2, meaning, that they form'd the articulate sounds: Nevertheless, as it was GOD'S LAW, and therefore suppos'd to come directly from HIM; it is called *the voice of* GOD HIMSELF. Deut. iv. 33. compared with Exod. xx. 19.

gain, be supposed the words of CHRIST. If from the representatives of the church, whether *Jewish* or *Christian*, the words belong absolutely to the persons so characteriz'd: they are the speakers, and not the angel, who might be employ'd to form the sounds. Once more,

3. NOT to admit what is now suggested, would oblige us to assert, that the angel must make a *sacrilegious incroachment* on OUR SAVIOUR's character in the several branches of it; nay, on the incommunicable character of THE one supreme GOD. For taking the attributes of these glorious persons upon himself, he certainly thrusts both of them out of their place.—But are *the sacred vestments*, which bespeak CHRIST to be our great HIGH PRIEST; is *the golden girdle*, that exhibits him as GOD's king; is *the sharp two-edged sword*, that goeth out of his mouth, and witnesseth, in a very expressive manner, to his PROPHETICAL office¹: are these, I say, emblems befitting a created angel? Is it for a creature to say *in his own name* (as though he were himself THE eternal JEHOVAH) *I am he, which is, and which was, and which am to come*²? Or, (where the description is plainly referable to CHRIST) *I am THE ALPHA and THE OMEGA, the beginning and the ending, the first and the last*; with that train of illustrious attributes assumed by the person in this vision³, and not only repeated, but enlarged upon in the second and

¹ Rev. ii. 13, 16,
ser. 13.—16, 18.

² Ibid. ver. 8.

³ Ibid.

third chapters? He, who can make this sacrifice, may hold every thing *in revelation* indifferent. Can a created angel be universally present in the midst of the Christian church? Has a created angel the supreme authority under God in all affairs, temporal and spiritual? Can he charge himself with the care and protection of the church, and therefore with the superintendency of all persons and things? Can he dispense rewards and punishments of the nature with those, respectively promised and threaten'd in this book? Is he the person, who is *to come in the clouds*, as supreme judge of angels and men under THE FATHER? the person, whom St. *John* saw thus coming?—He, that can believe this, must surrender, not, the dictates of revelation only; but (if I might say it without offence) his claim to the distinguishing characteristic of a man.

GIVE me leave then to ask: Is not *the general plan*, on which *The Revelation* is wrote, entirely against your lordship in this case? Is not *the very nature* of the present vision; *the very offices*, with which the person, who appears in it, is charged, a contradiction to your whole scheme? Can we reflect, either on the dignity of THE ONE GOD, or on the character and capacity of THE ONE MEDIATOR; and not see, that they are equally abhorrent from your lordship's principles? However, fully to set aside every presumption of this kind, I have to observe

4. LASTLY, That it is so far from being true, that the angel was *the sole actor* through this book, especially, where matters refer either to GOD or CHRIST; that it is clear to a demonstration, both that OUR blessed SAVIOUR had *his part* to act in *this historical drama*, and also, that he performed it *in person*. This we see not only in several emblematic representations, introduced in different parts of this book; particularly, where he appears as A LAMB in the midst of THE THRONE, ch. v. 6. And again, as A LAMB, which could alone open *the seven seals*, ch. vi. And as A MIGHTY ANGEL, *clothed with a cloud*, and having a *rainbow upon his head*, ch. x. 1. And, once more, as A LAMB *standing on mount Sian*, ch. xiv. 1, with others of this kind. I say, therefore, it is not only evident from the above representations, that CHRIST is personally active in this prophecy, in contradistinction from *the angel*; but also, more especially, from his own positive declarations on this head, speaking of himself *by name*, and speaking in *the first person*; therefore speaking for himself, and not by the mouth of another.

THE PASSAGE, I have now more immediately in view, is, that in the twenty-second chapter, verse the sixteenth, where OUR SAVIOUR bespeaks the beloved disciple in these terms: I JESUS *have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches, &c.* The words, therefore, apparently come from CHRIST himself [here, at least, *emblematically present in person*;) be the instrument, that
form'd

form'd them, who, or what, he will. And, indeed, the latter part of this chapter (as we shall see more fully hereafter, meaning) from the 12th verse to the 19th inclusive, appears to have been spoken by CHRIST himself; if not really, however, *emblematically* attending in his own person. But, if we find him here on the spot, in the close of the prophecy; it is certainly a good reason, why we should likewise suppose him present on the opening of it.

AND, in truth, I cannot help thinking, that this appearance is to be found at the 8th verse of the first chapter, though passed over by your lordship; as well as in the vision more directly before us. For here, in perfect agreement with the characters taken-up by himself in the twenty-second chapter, we find him coming-in and saying: *I am ALPHA and OMEGA, the beginning and the ending, saith THE LORD; which is, and which was, and which is to come, THE ALMIGATY.* Now here, it may, probably, be thought by some, that the characters are all of the DIVINE kind, in the strict and highest sense of the word; what I mean is, that they are all the peculiar of THE ONE GOD, or FATHER, and have no manner of reference to CHRIST, THE MEDIATOR. But though it must be confess'd, that the characters are all of the most august nature; and therefore, undoubtedly include DEITY; yet this one single consideration, is sufficient to satisfy us, that CHRIST, as MEDIATOR, has his part in the description: Namely, that they re-

fer us to the great affair of *the future judgment*, as the concluding event of all prophecy. But, when *the judgment* is the object in view, we very well know, that THE MEDIATOR must take place; because THE FATHER separately, or in his own person, *judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto THE SON, because he is THE SON of man*¹. Moreover, it is said, that GOD *will judge the world in righteousness by THE MAN, CHRIST*². So that, in this single event, we find the DIVINE and MEDIATORIAL persons united; and it is necessary, it should be so; that our judge may be *visible* on the one part, and *omniscient* on the other; things reciprocally applied to GOD and CHRIST, on account of GOD's dwelling in THAT MAN, and THAT MAN's dwelling in GOD. Here then, as a just representation of *this future judgment*, we see them both united in the vision, which St. John now had of OUR LORD, and therefore of GOD in HIM, *coming to judgment*. And what so necessary and proper as that, in the introduction of this prophecy, BOTH these great personages should take place, as jointly concern'd in all those transactions, which make up the body of this prophecy; and which, in their accomplishment, equally affect the glory of the DIVINE and MEDIATORIAL beings?

This then, I take the liberty of saying, appears to me, a revelation of CHRIST in his own person, speaking his own words; speaking for himself, and not by an angel: and

¹ John v. 22, 27.

² Acts xvii. 31.

speaking

speaking too, without any previous notice of his appearing, or any *emblematical* symbols directing to it; just as we have already seen, and shall farther see, the case turn out in the 22d chapter.

THE REASON, inclining me to this interpretation of the place, is: Because these words being deliver'd in, what we may call, *The Prologue*, before any *angelical* machinery of *scenes* or *symbols* appear to take place; it seems to leave us fully assured, that the present declaration was made without the interposition or ministry of any angel whatever; and therefore that they are really the words of CHRIST himself, condescending to give St. *John*, in his entrance on this book, such a display of himself as he once vouchsafed St. *Paul*, when journeying to *Damascus*. — What to me, seems greatly to countenance a supposition of this kind, is, that on St. *John's* having mentioned the name of CHRIST in the 5th and 6th verses, with singular emotion; his soul, as it were, taking fire at the name; OUR blessed SAVIOUR, while he was thus all extacy in the contemplation of the subject, as well to endear himself to St. *John*, as to strengthen his faith in *his second coming*; condescends to open to him an immediate representation, or image, of himself in that particular branch of his glory. So that he cries out in the 7th verse, as one actually seeing him: *Behold! he cometh with clouds, &c.* Here then presents a direct view of OUR SAVIOUR's person, and upon this follows the

declaration from his lips : *I am ALPHA and OMEGA, &c.* As tho' he had said : " Here I am " *in person* to answer the ardor of thy faith, " and to assure thy pious expectations : Here " I am, the person, whose glories thou hast " described, with whose love thou art in- " flam'd, and whose appearance thou longest " for. And take this with thee, *my future* " *coming* shall be as sure and sudden, as the " view with which I am now indulging thee".

—What then is there, either harsh or im- probable, in this representation of the text? considering, besides *the general plan* on which the whole prophecy is deliver'd, both *the place*, where this exhibition stands, and *the words*, by which it is introduc'd : the one, *b. e.* the exhibition or view, as it should seem, turning-up prior to the services of the angel ; and the other, *b. e.* the words, making no part of the prophecy itself, but coming-in either as a *prologue* to the work, or a kind of *dedication* of it to the seven *Asiatic* churches ; and, in them, to the *Christian* church, universally.

BUT, whether this be the real matter of fact, or not (though, I cannot but think, it has high probability on it's side ;) let it only be supposed, on the other hand, that the angel was likewise concerned in exhibiting the present vision of CHRIST ; what would the conclusion be ? Only, that he rais'd the scene, and form'd these articulate sounds in the air ; and not, that he either personated CHRIST, or spoke *authoritatively* in his own name. Be-
cause

cause there is full as much reason to suppose, that these words come from OUR SAVIOUR himself, now appearing *in emblem* ; as there is to suppose, that any words in the whole prophecy come in this manner from him : And yet none can deny, but those must needs be his own words, where he prefixes *his name*, and speaks absolutely in *the first person*, chapter twenty second.

HAVING then, I apprehend, intirely wrested the accounts at the 10th verse, from the gloss put upon them by your lordship ; I now go on to what follows in *this section* : “ And “ verse 13, when he turned to see the Voice “ that spake with him, he says, *And when I “ saw him, I fell at his Feet as dead : And he “ laid his Right-hand upon me, saying unto me, “ Fear not : I am the First and the Last ; I am “ he that liveth and was dead ; and behold I am “ alive for evermore.* Whence (as your lordship “ continues to observe) it is manifest that this “ Angel speaks at once both in the Name of “ God the Father, and of God the Son “. How does this appear ? “ Because he calls himself “ *Alpha and Omega* ” [which characters, I presume, your lordship refers to THE FATHER ;] “ and yet declares he was once *dead* ” ; supposing, again, these words to refer to THE LORD JESUS CHRIST.

Now, not to observe, that it has been already proved, that the person here speaking, is so far from being a created angel, that he is no other than THE MEDIATOR himself, speaking

ing in his own person; there seems to me sufficient room to make it a question, whether, in his delivery of these several characters, he has not a direct reference to himself in his MEDIATORIAL capacity. My reasons for making this question are,

I. THAT the present vision absolutely gives us this idea of the MEDIATORIAL person: that is to say, directly points us to CHRIST, THE MEDIATOR, as the person now seen by St. *John*, in every part of it. And there is, doubtless, this good reason, why the whole of this vision should terminate more expressly on THE MEDIATOR: viz. That particular notice had been taken of THE FATHER, above, at the 8th verse; and therein particular care used to secure to him his share of honour, as still appearing with CHRIST in all affairs relative to the church, and appearing still AS SUPREME. Wherefore this grand point being secured, it seems but reasonable and necessary in this place, that THE MEDIATOR should now stand exhibited, more directly, in his own precise character. And to assure us, that it is CHRIST himself, now appearing in this light, it is very observable, that we find the person, here seen by St. *John*, and now speaking to him, attended with *all the ensigns*, which are peculiar to the three-fold office of CHRIST, as MEDIATOR. Again,

II. BE-

II. BECAUSE it is obvious, that the person addressing the seven *Asiatic* churches, in the 2d and 3d chapters; absolutely proceeds on the plan of this vision, or acts in a consistency with the person here speaking to St. John: Therefore assuming to himself such attributes, and issuing forth such sanctions, as can be applied to no other person than CHRIST, as MEDIATOR. This agreement therefore between the person appearing in this vision, and the person principally acting in those chapters, proves it to be CHRIST, and no other, in the next, immediate sense of the question. — Besides, it is very remarkable, that the person there addressing the churches (after taking his first character from his situation *in the midst of them*) sets the present character ALPHA and OMEGA at the head of all his other characters; by that means, giving the churches a full view of himself *in his person and constitution*. Nor so only: For it is to be observ'd,

III. IN the next place, that *the kingdom of CHRIST*, as MEDIATOR, is *the grand subject* of this whole book; which makes it therefore necessary, that he take the first opportunity of giving a display of himself in this quality: By this method to apprise us, that he is THE great HERO of *this prophetic drama*; and therefore the chief, external administrator in all the interesting events of which it is compos'd. This then exactly comports, with the view
we

we have of him, both in the present vision, and in the matter of the two subsequent chapters; as well as in a variety of places through the whole piece. Once more,

IV. THERE is farther evidence of CHRIST's making the present appearance in this vision, because it is notorious in itself, and, indeed, acknowledged by your lordship, that he is expressly and solely refer'd to by those words in the begining of the 18th verse, where the person saies; *I am he, that liveth, and was dead.* Now as these and the foregoing words [the FIRST and THE LAST] stand in close connexion with each other, and are allowed to be spoken by one and the same person; and it is certain, these latter words can only be applied to CHRIST, as MEDIATOR; there seems, I apprehend, sufficient reason to conclude, that the whole description belongs to him; especially, as this character, THE FIRST and THE LAST, is no other, than what the person, addressing the seven churches, afterwards takes upon himself; which person, we may be sure, from what has been already suggested; namely, the agreement between *the work* he is there employ'd in, and *the appearance* he makes in this vision; is, and can be, no other, than THE MEDIATOR.

V. THERE is likewise this farther ground for taking the characters in this light, because they will appear to tally exactly with his charge

as

as MEDIATOR; since, in this view of them, they will be found to include *the two extremes* of his MEDIATORIAL kingdom. For as, in the word ALPHA or THE FIRST, we cannot but contemplate him, as *set-up by THE FATHER from everlasting*; being both *his FIRST work*, and *his FIRST constitution*: So, in the word OMEGA or THE LAST, we shall have a view of *the conclusion* of his MEDIATORIAL government; when he comes *to deliver-up the kingdom to HIS FATHER* *. And then,

VI. LASTLY, Though it must be confess'd, that these characters belong to THE ONE GOD [however, as THE GOD of Revelation] being applied to him by the prophet *Isaiah* ²; yet it will be found, that CHRIST has also a just claim to them, as MEDIATOR; when it is remember'd, that THE MEDIATOR involves *the presence, or indwelling*, of THE ONE GOD to the constitution of his person. So that, as he has full right to assume the other characters appropriate to DEITY in consequence of *the above inhabitation*; he must, of necessity, likewise, on the same principle, be allowed to have equal right to the present characters of ALPHA and OMEGA. By which view of the characters, as we secure their highest sense in reference to the DIVINE being himself; making them thus signify his eternity *a parte ante*, as well as *a parte post*: So, have we likewise, by the same means, the highest view, in which they can be applied to THE MEDIATOR;

* 1 Cor. xv. 24.

² Ch. xlv. 6.

meaning,

meaning, as he includes, to his *personal* frame, THAT GODHEAD, which is strictly THE FIRST and THE LAST. And, therefore, we have here a farther argument, in these very characters, for supposing, that CHRIST is the person, who now speaks; and also for supposing, that he speaks precisely in the MEDIATORIAL capacity.

THERE being then, as was said above, very good reason to conclude, that OUR SAVIOUR is here, in this vision; and again, in the 2d and 3d chapters of this book, as well as in several other parts of it; especially, on opening of *the seals*, and in the close of *The Revelation*; giving a display of HIMSELF, rather than of THE FATHER, in his precise character of MEDIATION; it obviates every thing, that your lordship has suggested with respect to any created angel, as supposed here speaking in the name of THE FATHER, and also in the name of CHRIST: The real state of the case, by all the lights we can come-at from the premises, giving a very different view of the present vision and the present characters, from that, in which they stand represented by *The Essay*.

YOUR LORDSHIP, however, goes on to observe from hence as follows: "And yet, Chapter iii. 14. this same Angel speaks only in the Name of *Jesus Christ*, saying, *These Things saith the Amen*, the faithful and true Witness, THE BEGINNING OF THE CREATION OF GOD".—But as this character, *the begining of the creation of God*, is exactly parallel

parallel to that of THE ALPHA, when applied to CHRIST, both as *the FIRST production* of ALMIGHTY GOD, and also as THE ONE MEDIATOR; it therefore requires no farther consideration in this place. Because, as they respectively belong to the same person; so, it has been already shewn, that that person is CHRIST, a branch of our nature. I procede, therefore,

To the next *section*, which begins thus:
 “ However, towards the Close of the whole
 “ Revelation, St. *John* says, *I John saw these*
 “ *things, &c*”. Ch. xxii. 8—10 verse. Then,
 as a proof of this angel’s speaking in his own
 name, your lordship procedes with verse 12th.
 —“ *And behold I come quickly, and my Re-*
 “ *ward is with me, to give to every Man ac-*
 “ *cording as his Works shall be. I am Alpha*
 “ *and Omega, the Beginning and the End,*
 “ *the First and the Last*”.——But what fol-
 lows? “ *I Jesus have sent mine Angel to testify*
 “ *unto you these Things in the Churches. I am*
 “ *the Root and the Offspring of David, and the*
 “ *bright and the Morning-Star*”.——What
 then is your lordship’s conclusion from hence?
 That we have *section* lxxii: “ Where it is
 “ manifest, that this *Angel* who had refused
 “ Worship and Adoration, and had declared
 “ himself to be a created Being, the Fellow-
 “ Servant of *John*, and of his Brethren the
 “ Prophets; yet because he was sent by *Jesus*
 “ to testify that *Revelation*, which was given
 “ unto

“ unto *Jesus* by *God*, he therefore speaks in-
 “ differently in the first Person, *I*, either
 “ when he speaks in his own Person, in the
 “ Person of *Jesus*, or in the Person of *God*
 “ the Father ”.

As to his speaking in the person of THE FATHER, I have before shewn, that the characters of ALPHA and OMEGA, which your lordship supposes solely descriptive of THE FATHER, are here the next, immediate property of CHRIST, THE MEDIATOR. And therefore, that though other characters are coupled with those, undoubtedly expressive of that connexion, which there is between THE FATHER and CHRIST; and, consequently, of THE FATHER'S concern with CHRIST in the affairs of the MEDIATORIAL kingdom: Yet, that this is not an angel speaking for THE FATHER or CHRIST; but OUR SAVIOUR speaking, both for himself and HIS FATHER. And, I believe, it will always be found, that, where we meet with any declarations from THE THRONE, as the ensign of the DIVINE majesty; that there those declarations are always made by CHRIST himself: And very justly, as the subject of the whole book is his MEDIATORIAL kingdom; and as he is strictly the external, visible agent, in all transactions relative to it.

THEN, as to this angel's speaking in the person of CHRIST; plausible as that may seem, at first sight, in the present representation;

tation; the contrary will be found the real truth of the place, when the one following observation is duly consider'd: Namely, The whole book of *Revelation*, your lordship is very sensible, is wrote on a *dramatic plan*: The principal actors in it are CHRIST, as *head over all for the church*; and a *created angel*, retain'd by CHRIST through the whole, for forming the necessary *mechanical* operations; and to act, as I may say, in quality of *demonstrator* to St. *John*. Hence it is, that this angel appears frequently *on the stage* (if I may be allowed the expression;) but CHRIST only now and then, as extraordinary occasions require. Here then, drawing to the close of *the drama*, by having gone through the several leading representations, which were to affect the *Christian church*, from the resurrection of OUR SAVIOUR to the consummation of all things; St. *John*, from a grateful sense of the numerous favours thus done him by the angel, *throws himself at his feet*, with a design to worship him, verse the 8th. But the angel, conscious that he was not the object of religious adoration, according to the character he here gives of himself, absolutely refuses this homage, saying: *Worship GOD*, verse the 9th; going on with some farther intimations to St. *John* in these words: *Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book: for the time is at hand*, verse the 10th. *He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he which is filthy, let him be filthy*

filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still, verse 11th.—This then, as I take it, is the last speech, we have from *the angel*; here his part seems to conclude.

BUT then, OUR SAVIOUR having, likewise, *personally*, bore a considerable part in this performance, particularly in *the opening* of it; at the same time, making use of the ministry of *this created angel*, in the first chapter: As it is usual in all pieces of this kind, that the several chief characters be brought together, at once, upon the stage *in the last scene*; so, we shall find, that CHRIST, as well as *the angel*, is here, again, introduced, to make one such speech, as might close the whole work, in a manner worthy himself. The angel's part therefore, as was observ'd above, fully terminates at the end of the 11th verse; and whether he make *his exit*, or was yet standing with St. *John*, as we may see on our stages; it matters little: CHRIST now enters and issues the whole drama *in his own person*, just as he had opened it; for I have before shewn that to be the case. Hence therefore (to speak in the language of *the theatre*) he comes upon the stage, saying: *And, behold! I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be:* verse the 12th. And to prove that he hath a proper power and authority to make *these distributions*, he repeats those parts of his character, which are of the
greatest

greatest compass: *I am ALPHA and OMEGA the beginning and the end, THE FIRST and THE LAST*, in the MEDIATORIAL kingdom; verse 13th: It being therefore his province to punish the wicked, and reward the righteous. And so he goes on, till, in the 16th verse, he comes to say, turning himself to St. *John*, as yet on the stage: *I JESUS have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches*; adding several of his other illustrious characters: *I am the root, and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning-star*. Till, in his last speech, at the 20th verse, he subjoins: *He, which testifieth these things* [whether he mean, what he had just now been speaking himself, or the body of what he had delivered by the angel, or both. For *the energy*, by which *the whole revelation* was made, center'd wholly in himself, as MEDIATOR. Because, as I have shewn above, where *the minister* is, there also is CHRIST. And if *he* testify these things by *his angel*, much more may he be said to testify *them* HIMSELF; both as frequently speaking in person, and always qualifying the angel for this service: *He, which testifieth these things*] *saith, surely, I come quickly*. Thus ending *The Revelation* with that event, which is to bring on the period of the MEDIATORIAL kingdom; that event, into which all the lines of prophecy, and therefore all the representations of this book, are to run and lose themselves.

—Upon which St. *John*, by way of *chorus*

for himself and the whole church, not only cries out, *Amen*; to second HIS LORD's promise; but follows it also with a *prayer* to him, to assure us, that HE is the true object of DIVINE WORSHIP, though *the angel*, to whom he attempted it before, refused it as none of his property: EVEN so, COME, LORD JESUS.—Only subjoining farther, by way of *Epilogue* (as he had his *Prologue* at the beginning of the book) a *benediction* on the churches, to whom he wrote: THE GRACE of OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST be *with you all*. AMEN.

THIS *dramatic prophecy* then, both in its proper order of time, and in it's several distinct branches; as carried-on by different persons, and including different speeches; St. *John* both *saw* and *heard*: And therefore being eye and ear-witness to the contents of the whole book; it was no more to his purpose, in a recital of this *historical* performance, to say: "Now enters the angel, and now CHRIST; "now we hear the angel speaking, and now "THE MEDIATOR"; than we find it necessary, in our day, to make *prefatory speeches* of that kind, when the different actors enter upon our own stage. We see them and hear them; and are supposed acquainted, both with their persons and characters. And just such is the case here to an attentive, intelligent reader.—Besides, he will readily inform himself from the different nature of the subject, as
here

here handled, either by *the angel*, or CHRIST; which part belongs to *the creature*, and which to HIS LORD, without any previous notice in the left. And it is upon this principle, in conjunction with *the divisions* made above; that I presume to hope, all difficulties, in reference to *the true speaker* in these passages, are cleared-up; and, consequently, that the expectation, your lordship had rais'd from them, is render'd abortive.

SINCE it is then plain, on the examination of these several scriptures, that your lordship has fail'd in proving, either that *prophets* or *angels*, ever spoke *authoritatively* in their own names; assuming *the characters*, challenging *the works*, or indulging *the reverence*, and therewith using *those modes of speech*; which belong solely to THE invisible JEHOVAH, or to CHRIST THE MEDIATOR: The conclusion from the whole is, that neither *Michael*, nor any other created angel, can deliver himself *in the first person*, and say, merely by virtue of an high delegation of power: I AM THAT AM; *I am* THE GOD of *Abraham*; THE GOD of *Beth-el*, &c.

So that *the objection*, rais'd above by your lordship, standing in it's full force; it is plain, something more is requir'd than the consideration of such a delegated power, to warrant THE JEHOVAH of *Zion*, which, with your lordship, intends *Michael*; but with me (submitting to your distinction) OUR SAVIOUR,

CHRIST; to call himself by the characters appropriate to SUPREME DIVINITY, and to claim the privilege of speaking and acting *authoritatively* in his own name.—And what principle can this be, excepting *that close connexion*, which, as I have often inforc'd, actually subsists between the DIVINE and MEDIATORIAL persons? Since, THAT BEING, surely, may call himself by any of the names of God, and likewise take to himself any of his works; and, moreover, claim a part with him in the same worship; who is THE TABERNACLE of GOD: THE MAN, in whom he dwels, and THE MEDIUM, thro' which he acts; therefore also, *the brightness of glory*, and *the express image of THE FATHER'S person*.

I KNOW not, however, whether yet to strengthen the argument against your lordship, it might not be proper to close this head, by throwing-in an observation hinted at before: It is then certain, that all action, as such, is God's. Therefore, whatever we transact, he must be consider'd, both as actually present with us, and primarily efficient, in what we do; meaning, in respect to the act itself, abstractly consider'd. Hence, when any thing is said to be done *by the power of God*, it positively intends *the presence and concurrence of God* to the work itself, as an action barely. For Sir Isaac Newton has convinc'd us, that to speak of *the power of God*, without *the presence of God*, is a contradiction or absurdity.

dity. Agreeable to this, we are said *to live, move* [or *be moved*] *and have our being in* God². — This then being true of every action, in common, as such; whatever is done, though in common only, it is referable [as a bare act] to THAT GOD, by whose power, and in consequence of whose presence, we perform it. Hence then, the higher we rise in the scale of being, and the higher the business of action runs; as there is *more of the* DIVINE *power* exerted: So, we may say [as to manifestation or influence, at least] that *more of the presence of* GOD is absolutely attendant. Wherefore, if THIS GOD be present, in a lower degree, with every man, in the common actions of life; he is, doubtless, still present, in an higher degree, with *a prophet*; and yet, in an higher, with *an angel*, and so on.

As it is then apparent from hence, that where *the ministers of* GOD, or CHRIST, are; there those very persons are, likewise, themselves: the necessary consequence, in respect to the subject before us, must be, not that either *prophet*, or *angel*, deliver their own words, or speak authoritatively in their own names [when they express themselves by *the first person*, I;] but that, being properly *the representative* and *voice*, either of GOD or CHRIST; those persons are to be considered as the real speakers on all these occasions; *the*

¹ Vide Principia Philosoph. Schol. generale sub finem.

² Acts xvii. 28.

prophet, or angel, at the same time, taking no higher character than that of being their mouth only.

NEITHER is there any thing more necessary on the part of the people, to carry them, immediately, either to the DIVINE or MEDIATORIAL being, as their glorious constituents; than to remember, what *their public character* is on the one part, and what their *prophecy or doctrine* is on the other. Because the hearers, taking this single hint along with them, will be so far from considering *the prophet or angel*, as speaking in his own name, as though *a principal* in the affair; that they will instantly be led to look through *the minister to the sovereign*: and, as was said above, consider the words as coming, primarily, not from *the prophet or angel himself*, but either from GOD or CHRIST, as persons really present with them, and speaking instrumentally by them. In this light therefore, the words will always be either JEHOVAH'S, or THE MEDIATOR'S, though delivered by the prophet or angel *in the first person*; the people, as your lordship has observed, being prepared by the considerations, here laid down, to make-up for *any deficiency* that may occur, from their not repeating those words, *Thus saith THE LORD*, at the beginning of every individual member of *their prophecy or message*.

My business, now, would have been, to have taken into consideration THE NEGATIVE

on

on the second question propos'd ; by which I stand engaged to evince THE *true* and *proper* DIVINITY of THE HOLY GHOST : But I am, on that part of the subject, for the present, absolutely prevented, by the length to which this letter is already extended. A step, I would gladly have avoided ; had I not found myself obliged to it by the nature of the argument. For, though it is certain, that your lordship, and the more learned reader, would have readily enter'd into the purport of THAT CANNON for interpreting holy scripture at page 208, &c. and therefore have made a just application of it, both to *the scriptures themselves*, exhibited in *The Essay*, and also to *the different characters*, by which OUR SAVIOUR is there represented : [The two particulars, which have principally occasioned the present enlargement :] The case, however, it will be readily own'd, is quite otherwise with the body of Christians. For which reason I could not but think, that a *diffuse explication* of those several scriptures, on the one part ; and a *particular application* of THE above CANNON, on the other ; would be a necessary and acceptable service. Because, by this means, every reader will not only have an opportunity of seeing the principle of interpretation every where *intire* ; but, likewise, be enabled, with less trouble, to judge of *it's propriety* in the different cases, to which it is applied. Wherefore, as nothing has been aim'd-at by this enlargement,

but

but that of rendering the present attempt more generally useful ; I would hope, it may be admitted as a sufficient apology for *some repetitions*, which might otherwise have justly incur'd the censure of being equally *unnecessary* and *immethodical*. I am,

MY LORD,

YOUR LORDSHIP'S

DEALE:
Octob. 19,
1753.

Most obedient, and

Most devoted humble servant.



POST-

P O S T S C R I P T.

AS it will, doubtless, be observ'd, that at page 287, &c. I insist on *the actual presence* of THE eternal JEHOVAH in the vision of *the flaming bush*; and that, afterwards, at page 294, I assert, that CHRIST, THE ANGEL of THE COVENANT, was the person, who appeared to *Moses*: It may, probably, suggest matter for what may be thought a formidable objection; especially, as *the united presence* and *joint energy* of THE FATHER and CHRIST, is the grand principle, contended for through the whole of this letter. The objection then will be to this purpose: Namely, that, on this plan of interpretation, we shall be absolutely at a loss in the application of the several *personal* characters, which occur in these histories. Or, in other words: We shall never be able to ascertain the person, who really appears and acts in services of this kind; meaning, whether it be THE FATHER, or CHRIST; THE ONE GOD, or THE ONE MEDIATOR.

BUT

BUT, to remove every difficulty of this sort, I am inclined to think, enough has been said at page 220, *particular the 3d*: Where we are directed to consider, *what character is most illustrious in the text*: that is to say, whether THE DIVINITY, OR THE HUMANITY, makes *the principal figure* in the narrative; in consequence of which we are to determine, whether the character and the actions annexed to it, are to be refer'd, *more directly* to the DIVINE being; or, more directly, to CHRIST. Not but, as has been likewise observed, let *the distinguishing mark* rise, as it will; for instance, supposing from DIVINITY; we shall, nevertheless, find, that the account, in one part or other, always descends to, and involves *the humanity*. And, again, on the contrary, where the character is drawn, chiefly, from *the humanity*, it is observable, the narrative, if thoroughly examined, never breaks-off, without carrying us up to THE DIVINITY: On account of *that inseparable connexion*, which obtains between the DIVINE and MEDIATORIAL persons. And; it is proper, we should remember, that this is the true reason, why there is still *that mixture* of character in all these histories, if taken at large: What I mean is, why there are some things said of the person appearing and acting, which suit THE DIVINITY only; and, again, others, that belong wholly to *the human nature*: Which is particularly the case, with regard
to

to the apparition *in the bush*; and is therefore, what warrants *the double application* here made.

So that, when this rule of interpretation is carefully attended, I imagine, there will be no difficulty in distinguishing the characters, as they are either more strictly DIVINE, or more directly HUMAN; nor, therefore, in making the regular application of them to GOD or CHRIST; as the character itself, in these cases, may happen to preponderate, either on the side of JEHOVAH, or on the side of THE MESSIAH: the plain consequence of which must be, that we shall run no risque of confounding *the distinct personalities* of THE FATHER and SON. See likewise page 218.

THOUGH, after all, this one short observation, frequently inculcated in the course of these papers, may fully settle this point: Namely, that CHRIST, as MEDIATOR, is always *the external, visible agent*, thro' these several appearances. While, what is contended for more, is only: That he is, nevertheless, so far from being *solitary* on these occasions, that the DIVINE being, or THE invisible JEHOVAH, is always present in him, and operative with him: So that CHRIST acts *immediately*, but THE FATHER *supremely*.—And this, I apprehend, is the true reason, why many of those things, which are directly applied to THE invisible JEHOVAH himself in the old testament, whether relative to *Moses* in particular,
or

or to *The Israelites* in general ; are, in the new testament account of these matters, more directly applied to CHRIST, THE MEDIATOR. Witness those declarations by St. *Stephen* and St. *Paul*, taken notice of above, at p. 293, &c. compared with p. 303—309.

T H E E N D.



ADDI-

A D D I T I O N S.

PAGE 158. l. 7. from the bottom, after those words, the REGAL character, add: refering, more especially, to those two distinguish'd periods, mention'd at p. 84 and 85, &c.

Page 299. Note, l. 8. after §. xxxi, add [speaking of THE ONE GOD here, *in his abstract nature*, and not on the MEDIATORIAL constitution; in which *latter* sense only, I took the liberty to speak of him above, at p. 216, as a SPIRIT embodied; that is, as dwelling in THE MAN, CHRIST.] And where, &c.

Page 365. l. 9. after next to him, add [or, as I might express it, *in and with him*] MESSIAH, &c.

Page 458. Note, l. 8. after nevertheless, add: in it's common use, the extent, &c.

C O R R E C T I O N S.

PAGE 66. l. 18. for add r. odd. P. 116. l. 8. for advacacy r. advocacy. P. 143. l. 7. for 2. r. (2.) P. 186. l. 8. for betwen r. between. P. 258. l. 23. for thefore r. therefore. P. 264. l. 3. after above, insert]. P. 289. l. 13. for and r. an. P. 291. l. 18. for giving r. given. P. 294. l. 5 from bottom, for *Israelities* r. *Israelites*. P. 326. l. 7. for acount r. account. Ib. l. 10. for cireumstance r. circumstance. P. 331. l. 4 from bottom, for is r. it. P. 348. l. 5. for first r. first. P. 412. l. 11. after being r. the. P. 427. l. 4 from bottom, for And r. Add. P. 462. l. 9. for authoratative r. authoritative. P. 480. l. 2. from bottom, for martyr r. martyrs.

